

Bushnell Centenary

9.3.77

193d Annual
Meeting
General Association
of Connecticut
Hartford
June 17, 18, 1902

9.3.77

Bushnell Centenary

MINUTES

OF THE

GENERAL ASSOCIATION

OF

CONNECTICUT

AT THE

One Hundred and Ninety-Third Annual Meeting

HELD IN

HARTFORD, JUNE 17, 18, 1902

Hartford Press

THE CASE, LOCKWOOD & BRAINARD COMPANY

1902

OFFICERS

Moderator

ARTHUR GOODENOUGH

Scribe

FREDERICK E. ALLEN

Assistant Scribe

HENRY J. CONDIT

Standing Committee — 1901

JOSEPH H. TWICHELL

WILLIAM H. HOLMAN

JAMES W. COOPER

WILLIAM DELOSS LOVE

WILLIAM W. RANNEY

JOEL S. IVES

Standing Committee — 1902

JAMES W. COOPER

CHARLES F. ROBINSON

THEODORE T. MUNGER

JOHN HUTCHINS

JOHN G. DAVENPORT

JOEL S. IVES

NOTE — This issue of the Minutes of the Association is distributed to the members through the generosity of a friend.

Copies may be found on sale at Belknap & Warfield's at ten cents per copy.

CONTENTS

OFFICERS,	Page 3
MINUTES	
Addresses — Bushnell and Christian Nurture : The Doctrine, Rev. Charles E. McKinley ; The Mode, Rev. William J. Mutch,	100
Bushnell the Citizen, Charles Hopkins Clark,	58
Horace Bushnell, Christian Prophet, Rev. Edwin P. Parker,	86
Dr. Bushnell as a Religious Leader, Prof. Williston Walker,	15
Personal Reminiscences, Rev. Joseph H. Twichell,	70
Reminiscences of the Bushnell Controversy, Rev. Amos S. Chesebrough,	47
The Secret of Bushnell, Rev. Theodore T. Munger,	35
The Persistent Elements of our Historic Faith, Rev. Charles A. Northrop,	11
Welcome, Rev. William W. Ranney,	10
Committees — Nominating,	9
Standing for 1901,	3
Standing for 1902,	3
Standing for 1903,	11
Corresponding Members,	10
Devotional Service,	12
Minutes,	12
Next Meeting,	12
Pictures of Dr. Bushnell,	13
Posthumous Paper of Dr. Bushnell's,	13
Printing of Memorial Addresses,	13
Program,	9
Organization,	7
Roll,	7
Social Hour,	12
Tellers,	7
Thanks,	13
Treasurer — Report of,	14

MINUTES

THE GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT convened for its one hundred and ninety-third annual meeting in the Park Church, Hartford, at 11 o'clock Tuesday, June 17, 1902.

Organization

Charles A. Northrop, moderator for 1901, having declared a quorum present, called the Association to order, and, after responsive reading, read the first chapter of John and offered prayer.

Frederick E. Allen was chosen scribe and Henry J. Condit assistant scribe.

The moderator appointed Frank C. Potter and Charles A. Jaquith tellers.

MEMBERS

	Association		Association
Frederick E. Allen,	N. L.	Bert F. Case,	M.
John Allender,	N. H. C.	Amos S. Chesebrough,	M.
Augustus Alvord,	L. N.	George L. Clark,	H. S.
Eugene F. Atwood,	H. C.	Clement G. Clarke,	H. S.
Charles L. Ayer,	N. V.	Henry J. Condit,	H. C.
Edward P. Ayer,	N. V.	James W. Cooper,	H. S.
Francis P. Bachelier,	H. C.	Lyndon S. Crawford,	M.
John W. Ballantine,	F.	John G. Davenport,	N. V.
Clarence H. Barber,	H. N.	Finis E. Delzell,	M.
Elmer J. Beach,	N. H. U.	Sevrin K. Didriksen,	H. C.
Clark S. Beardslee,	H. C.	Frank B. Doane,	N. H. C.
James W. Bixler,	N. L.	John B. Doolittle,	H. C.
Ferdinand Q. Blanchard,	H. S.	William F. English,	H. C.
Daniel J. Bliss,	N. L.	Charles E. Ewing,	H. C.
M. Bradford Boardman,	H. S.	Silenus H. Fellows,	W.
Frank S. Brewer,	L. N.	George P. Fisher,	N. H. U.
Oliver H. Bronson,	H. C.	Samuel B. Forbes,	H. N.
George A. Bushee,	N. H. C.	Cyrus W. Francis,	F.
Newell M. Calhoun,	L. N.	George P. Fuller,	M.
William Carr,	N. L.	Andrew W. Gerrie,	L. N.

	Association		Association
Arthur L. Gillett,	H. N.	Austin H. Norris,	L. N.
David W. Goodale,	H. C.	Charles A. Northrop,	N. L.
Arthur Goodenough,	L. N.	Charles R. Palmer,	F.
Frederick L. Grant,	N. V.	Edwin P. Parker,	H. C.
John H. Grant,	H. S.	Lewis B. Paton,	M.
Russell T. Hall,	H. S.	Harry E. Peabody,	H. C.
Henry E. Hart,	H. C.	Charles B. F. Pease,	H. S.
William H. Hayes,	H. N.	Cyrus M. Perry,	T.
Austin Hazen,	N. V.	Lewis E. Perry,	W.
John M. Henrikson,	N. V.	Watson L. Phillips,	N. H. C.
Lucius H. Higgins,	N. L.	William H. Phipps,	N. V.
Horace G. Hoadley,	L. N.	Frank C. Porter,	N. H. U.
Thomas M. Hodgdon,	H. N.	Frank C. Potter,	M.
Frederick A. Holden,	N. V.	Rockwell H. Potter,	H. C.
William H. Holman,	F.	George F. Prentiss,	N. H. C.
John E. Hurlbut,	H. N.	William W. Ranney,	H. C.
John Hutchins,	L. S.	Franklin P. Reinhold,	H. C.
Edmund C. Ingalls,	N. L.	George W. Reynolds,	H. C.
Joel S. Ives,	H. S.	Thomas C. Richards,	L. N.
Charles A. Jaquith,	W.	Charles H. Ricketts,	T.
Frank A. Johnson,	L. S.	Silas W. Robbins,	H. N.
James G. Johnson,	H. C.	Henry B. Roberts,	L. N.
David E. Jones,	H. C.	Henry P. Schauffler,	H. S.
Newton I. Jones,	W.	William Slade,	M.
Henry H. Kelsey,	H. C.	Charles H. Smith,	H. N.
Harvey M. Lawson,	W.	George E. Soper,	F.
William W. Leete,	N. H. C.	Sherrod Soule,	N. V.
Everett E. Lewis,	M.	William F. Stearns,	L. N.
W. DeLoss Love,	H. C.	Wilson R. Stewart,	F.
Charles E. McKinley,	T.	Cyrus F. Stimson,	F.
William W. McLane,	N. H. C.	Dwight C. Stone,	M.
Calvin B. McLean,	L. N.	Edward G. Stone,	M.
Herbert Macy,	H. S.	William J. Tate,	M.
David D. Marsh,	H. N.	William H. Teel,	H. C.
Henry G. Marshall,	M.	A. Ferdinand Travis,	H. C.
Oliver W. Means,	H. N.	William B. Tuthill,	H. S.
Guiseppe Merlino,	H. C.	Joseph H. Twichell,	H. C.
Alexander R. Merriam,	H. C.	Henry Upson,	L. S.
Thomas M. Miles,	H. S.	Francis H. Viets,	W.
William E. B. Moore,	N. H. U.	Foster R. Waite,	H. C.
William H. Moore,	H. S.	Frank P. Waters,	N. V.
Warren J. Moulton,	N. H. C.	George F. Waters,	H. C.
Theodore T. Munger,	N. H. C.	Robert F. Wheeler,	H. C.
William J. Mutch,	N. H. C.	Henry C. Woodruff,	F.
Roscoe Nelson,	H. C.	Burt L. York,	F.

SUMMARY

Members by Associations

Fairfield,	9	Litchfield N.,	11	New Haven C.,	10	Windham,	6
Hartford C.,	30	Litchfield S.,	3	New Haven U.,	4		—
Hartford N.,	10	Middlesex,	13	New London,	7	Total,	130
Hartford S.,	14	Naug. Val.,	10	Tolland,	3		

Nominating committee

William F. Stearns, James W. Cooper, and William J. Mutch were elected a nominating committee.

Program

The standing committee reported the following program for the meeting which was accepted and approved.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1902

Morning, 11 to 12.30

Organization and Business

Address of Welcome

Rev. William W. Ranney, Hartford

Address of Retiring Moderator

Rev. Charles A. Northrop, Norwich

Afternoon, 2.30 to 5

Singing and Prayer

Business

Addresses

“Dr. Bushnell as a Religious Leader”

Prof. Williston Walker, New Haven

“The Secret of Bushnell”

Rev. Theodore T. Munger, New Haven

Paper “Reminiscences of the Bushnell Controversy”

Rev. Amos S. Chesebrough, New Hartford

Evening, 7.30 to 9.30

Addresses

“Bushnell, the Citizen”

Charles Hopkins Clark, Hartford

“Personal Reminiscences”

Rev. Joseph H. Twichell, Hartford

“Horace Bushnell: Christian Prophet”

Rev. Edwin P. Parker, Hartford

WEDNESDAY, June 18

Morning, 9 to 12

Devotional Service

Led by Rev. Lewis E. Perry, Killingly

Topic “Bushnell and Christian Nurture” “The Doctrine”

Rev. Charles E. McKinley, Rockville

“The Mode”

Rev. William J. Mutch, New Haven

Discussion

Paper

“Inspiration by the Holy Spirit”

A posthumous work by Dr. Bushnell

Rev. Edwin P. Parker

Treasurer

The report of the treasurer was presented and accepted. Joel S. Ives was chosen treasurer for the ensuing year.

Corresponding members

It was voted — That all Congregational ministers present not members of local associations, and also members of other denominations, be invited to sit as corresponding members.

Address of welcome

William W. Ranney, pastor of Park Church, gave an address of welcome.

Resolution regarding Mrs. Bushnell and Mrs. Burton

The following resolution was adopted unanimously by a rising vote :

Resolved, That the following be entered upon the records of the General Association, and that the Rev. William W. Ranney, pastor of the Park Church in Hartford, be instructed to communicate the same to Mrs. Horace Bushnell and to Mrs. Nathaniel J. Burton :

The General Association of the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, at its one hundred and ninety-third annual meeting, convened for the specific purpose of commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Rev. Horace Bushnell, D.D., LL.D., and now met with the church of which he was for many years the illustrious pastor, hereby records its grateful, reverent, and affectionate remembrance of his honored wife, still living among us, and sends to Mrs. Bushnell its cordial salutations with all tenderest wishes and prayers for her continued comfort and peace.

The same General Association meeting today with the church of which the Rev. Nathaniel J. Burton, D.D., was also for many years an honored pastor, and mindful of his intimate friendship with Dr. Bushnell and kinship with him in genius, hereby testifies its same tender remembrance of his wife, still living with us, and sends to Mrs. Burton the same salutations and benedictions.

Response from Mrs. Bushnell and Mrs. Burton

The following responses were later received by the Association and by vote spread upon the records :

HARTFORD, June 18, 1902.

To the General Association of the Ministers of Connecticut :

Mrs. Bushnell acknowledges with grateful thanks the resolution passed yesterday by the General Association of the ministers of Connecti-

cut—an expression so unexpected and so welcome of their sympathy and their interest. It has been often said that Dr. Bushnell lived till all men were at peace with him, but to Mrs. Bushnell it is permitted to live till all his brethren in the ministry love him. If she may carry to him such a message it would seem that it must add a joy to heaven itself. With the deepest gratitude she sends you the assurance that your words have brought her, as you desire, a great sense of peace and comfort.

That Dr. Burton's memory is associated by you with Dr. Bushnell's, and that both remembrances are conveyed in the words of Dr. Parker by the hand of our dear friend, Mr. Ranney, are facts that greatly enhance their value to the family of Dr. Bushnell.

MY DEAR MR. RANNEY:

Will you express for me what I wish it was in my power to say to the Association, convened at Park Church to do honor to the memory of Rev. Dr. Bushnell, for their loving tribute to my husband and their tender remembrance of me. It came most unexpectedly and touched me more than I can tell you.

Yours most sincerely,

RACHEL C. BURTON.

Address

Charles A. Northrop, the retiring moderator, delivered an address upon the theme, "The Persistent Elements of our Historic Faith."

Election of moderator

Upon nomination of the standing committee Arthur Goode-nough was chosen moderator, and by the retiring moderator was conducted to the chair.

The hymn, "The Head that once was crowned with thorns" was sung, and John G. Davenport led in prayer.

At 12.35 a recess was taken till 2.30.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON

At 2.30 the hymn, "Rock of Ages," was sung, and Frank A. Johnson led in prayer.

Standing committee

James W. Cooper, Theodore T. Munger, John G. Davenport, Charles F. Robinson, John Hutchins, and Joel S. Ives were elected the standing committee for the ensuing year.

Addresses

Prof. Williston Walker gave an address upon "Dr. Bushnell as a Religious Leader," and Theodore T. Munger upon "The Secret of Bushnell."

Paper

James W. Cooper read a paper prepared by Amos S. Chesebrough, with the title, "Reminiscences of the Bushnell Controversy."

At 5 o'clock a recess was taken till 7.30.

Social Hour

During the intermission a social hour was enjoyed, when the ladies of the Park Church served a bountiful collation to which the members of the Association and all ladies in attendance were invited. William W. Ranney, as host, called upon James G. Johnson, Lyndon S. Crawford, Franklin P. Reinhold, Sherrod Soule, Frederick W. Greene, Aaron C. Adams, Henry Upson, Rev. Frank J. Goodwin of Pawtucket, R. I., and Rev. Harry R. Miles of Brattleboro, Vt., who responded briefly.

TUESDAY EVENING

At 7.30 devotional services were led by Charles B. F. Pease.

Addresses

Mr. Charles Hopkins Clark, editor of the *Hartford Courant*, gave an address on "Bushnell, the Citizen"; Joseph H. Twichell on "Personal Reminiscences"; and Edwin P. Parker on "Horace Bushnell: Christian Prophet."

The hymn, "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name," was sung, the benediction pronounced by the moderator, and a recess taken till 9 A. M. Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 18

At 9 the Association met for a devotional service led by Lewis E. Perry.

Next meeting

It was voted — That the next meeting of the Association be held in the United Church, New Haven, beginning at 11 A. M., Tuesday, June 16, 1903.

Minutes

The minutes were read and approved, and the registrar was authorized to complete them for publication.

Printing of Memorial Addresses

It was voted — That a committee of five be appointed to whom the printing in pamphlet, or other form, the papers and addresses of this one hundred and ninety-third annual meeting of the General Association pertaining to the Bushnell memorial shall be committed.

Later the following were appointed as this committee: William W. Ranney, Joel S. Ives, James W. Cooper, Joseph Anderson, Henry Upson.

Pictures of Dr. Bushnell

It was voted — That the thanks of this Association be extended to Mrs. Mary B. Cheney for the gift of the copies of the picture of Dr. Bushnell to the members of the Association.

Thanks

It was voted — That the hearty thanks of the General Association of Connecticut are due and are hereby gratefully tendered to the Park Church in Hartford for the kind hospitality provided for us and ministered to us at the present memorable annual meeting.

Addresses

Charles E. McKinley gave an address on "Bushnell and Christian Nurture — The Doctrine," and William J. Mutch on "Bushnell and Christian Nurture — The Mode."

Posthumous Paper by Dr. Bushnell

Edwin P. Parker read a posthumous and incomplete paper by Dr. Bushnell entitled "Inspiration by the Holy Spirit."

After singing "Blest be the tie that binds" prayer was offered by John Hutchins.

At 12.20 the Association adjourned.

ARTHUR GOODENOUGH, *Moderator.*

FREDERICK E. ALLEN, *Scribe.*

HENRY J. CONDIT, *Assistant Scribe.*

JOEL S. IVES, *Registrar.*

REPORT

REPORT OF TREASURER OF GENERAL ASSOCIATION

*General Association of Connecticut in account with JOEL S. IVES, Treasurer,
for June 20, 1901 — June 18, 1902.*

DR.

1902.	May 22, Programs,	.	.	.	.	.	\$7.20
	Postage,	.	.	.	.	.	4 76
							<u>\$11.96</u>

CR.

May 22, By cash from General Conference,	.	.	\$11.96
--	---	---	---------

JOEL S. IVES, *Treasurer.*

HARTFORD, June 17, 1902.

ADDRESSES

DR. BUSHNELL AS A RELIGIOUS LEADER

BY WILLISTON WALKER

FATHERS AND BRETHREN : Time is the greatest of magicians and there is no art that works such transformations as the flight of years. As we meet here this afternoon in the graceful building the site of which Dr. Bushnell selected, confronted by his portrait in enduring marble, our hearts aglow with the beauty of the park that bears his name, on which our eyes have feasted as we came hither with one accord to do reverence to his memory, the eye of imagination calls up a very different scene. Fifty-two years ago this General Association of Connecticut was gathered in battle array in the plain meeting-house at Litchfield, and the object of its contention was the censure or the toleration of one with whom few even of those who championed his right to speak unfettered had full theologic sympathy, but whom we remember at this hour not only as one of the most eminent of the sons of Connecticut, but as one of the leaders of American Christianity.

Who he was and what he was, regarding whom a half century of the flight of time has wrought such a change, we shall attempt to set forth in the moments at our disposal. Yet the speaker is well aware of his limitations in attempting the task which the kindness of your committee has assigned to him. He belongs to a generation that knew not Dr. Bushnell after the flesh. He has not before him the picture of the man that rises in the memory of not a few who hear him. And he recalls that this is but one of the commemorations by which Dr. Bushnell has been honored during these passing weeks, wherein some of the most gifted and most beloved of our ministry have sought to set forth the character and describe the work we now seek to recall. He can hope to say little that is unfamiliar or that has not been well said before. Least of all can he expect to add anything to the admirable portrait of the man which the loving hands of Dr. Bushnell's daughters sketched in the

volume entitled "Life and Letters," or that given in the more recent work in which our honored Dr. Munger has set forth the characteristics of Dr. Bushnell's theology. The speaker acknowledges his deep indebtedness to those who have so thoroughly reaped the field before him. But he deems it not unfitting to the time and occasion to tell again in outline the story of Dr. Bushnell.

Horace Bushnell was born April 14, 1802, in the little village of Bantam in the township of Litchfield. His parents, Ensign and Dotha (Bishop) Bushnell, were sturdy New England folk, the father's line having been identified with Connecticut since its settlement. They were of the enterprising farming class that added the rudiments of manufacture to the tillage of the fields, and there is reason to believe that superior advantages for carding wool by machinery led the parents to change their Litchfield home for one in New Preston when Horace, their eldest child, was three years old. There at New Preston Horace spent an active, healthful, hard-working boyhood, sharing in the labors of the household of which he was a genial, fun-loving, thoroughly wholesome member, and gaining such schooling as a Connecticut rural community could furnish. Thus far there is nothing distinctive in the story. It is from such homes as these that Connecticut's noble contribution to the brain and the sinew, the education and the moral upbuilding of the United States has largely come. But in one important respect the New Preston family was unlike most contemporary homes. It represented more than one type of religious training. Its impress had not come from a single school of religious thought. The resolute, optimistic father had been trained a Methodist; the wise, patient and devotedly Christian mother had been of the Episcopal communion, and both were members of the Congregational church which was the one religious center of the New Preston community. The mother, who had early consecrated her boy to the ministry, brought him up in the kindly nurture of household piety; but that piety was not wholly of the old Calvinist or Edwardian type which most religious Connecticut families would then have exhibited. I do not imply that it was better. It was different, and it gave the growing Christian life of the boy a somewhat different tone from that of most of his contemporaries. Its natural fruitage was shown when in 1821, apparently without a struggle, he made profession of his Christian faith.

This public confession of Christ awoke the youth's desire for an education, and, seconded by all the assistance that his parents could offer, he entered Yale in 1823, at the rather mature age of twenty-one, possessed, as his tutor described him, of a "rude, original, discriminating mind," marked by vigorous individuality and easily conspicuous in a class that numbered in its fellowship such men as Henry Durant, later to found the University of California; William Adams, to be president of Union Theological Seminary; and N. P. Willis, to leave his name upon the roll of American men of letters. Of his college course the student later said, with characteristic honesty: "My figure in college was not as good as it should have been, especially at first, grew better, and came out well; but my religious character went down."

The experience which he thus describes is the common though always painful one through which many a man passes, oftentimes amid the mental awakenings of a college education, in transmuting a faith derived from parental example and instruction into a personal possession. Intellectual doubt, in all its disquieting insistence, took hold upon him, nor was its anguish lessened by a growing feeling that religion could never be demonstrated by the understanding,—the only way in which he then knew how to approach Christian truth. But one great result of Bushnell's college reading was that he steeped his mind in that profound, suggestive, and vastly influential treatise which the English poet-philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge put forth in 1825, and named, with an aptness of title never exceeded, the "Aids to Reflection". Coleridge not merely introduced German theology to English readers, he broke with the dialectic and formally logical method of demonstrating and explaining Christian truth then characteristic of all Anglo-Saxon thinking. To him, Christianity is to be grasped not so much by the understanding as by intuition, or, as he prefers to style it, the "reason". Christian truth is not so much to be demonstrated by logic as perceived by the ethical and spiritual feeling. Spiritual truths, even the existence of God himself, "derive their evidence", he declared, "from within"; to be really believed, there must be a "pre-disposing warmth in the soul."

It is not our task here to point out in any detail the mighty influence which Coleridge exercised in the development of English theology, especially that of the Broad Church school, during the nine-

teenth century. Our purpose is with the student at Yale into whose hands Coleridge's volume came. He did not find it easy reading. As he said of it later :

"For a whole half year I was buried under his 'Aids to Reflection', and trying vainly to look up through. I was quite sure that I saw a star glimmer, but I could not quite see the stars. My habit was only landscape before ; but now I saw enough to convince me of a whole other world somewhere overhead, a range of realities in higher tier, that I must climb after, and if possible, apprehend."

But he held to it till he had mastered it, and its thoughts had in a measure mastered him, and it remained a power with him always. It was of the utmost significance for Bushnell's further development that he fell under the spell of a thinker so congenial to his native temperament, and so suggestive to his creative imagination. What he read became germinal in his fertile and poetic mind to a degree that has been rarely equaled. Coleridge introduced him to a different range of thought from that in which contemporary New England theology moved.

Bushnell's new thoughts, which his reading inspired rather than instilled, did not resolve his intellectual doubts, and he graduated in 1827, still in a sea of perplexity as to the claims of the Gospel. A brief period of teaching at Norwich, Conn., only demonstrated to his own mind his unfitness for the work of the classroom, and, in February, 1828, he accepted the post of associate editor of the "*New York Journal of Commerce*". The experience was one which brought him wide acquaintance with men and affairs, but little personal satisfaction ; and it was with a conviction, as he said, that journalism is "a terrible life" that he resigned his editorship in January, 1829, and entered the Law Department at Yale. His purpose was to go West the following summer and seek a career in politics through the gateway of the Law. But that summer brought an invitation to a tutorship at Yale, and his mother's wishes turned his reluctant decision to its acceptance. For the next two years he divided his time between the instruction of Freshmen and his own further studies in preparation for the bar. But, just as his course in Law was completed, there came to him the deciding point in his religious experience. A great wave of revival swept over the college in the winter of 1831. His own want of sympathy with its enthusiasm distressed him. He was impressed especially by his obligations to those committed to him. He felt that he must do his duty to them. The conviction grew in

him that he must "take the principle of right" for his law. And, having come to this determination, to follow such light as he could see, the great flood of emotion, the mighty rush of feeling, by which he was always mastered when his nature was profoundly stirred, burst the barrier of his intellectual doubts. As he said in anguish to his fellow-tutors :

"I have a heart as well as a head. My heart wants the Father ; my heart wants the Son ; my heart wants the Holy Ghost — and one just as much as the other. My heart says the Bible has a Trinity for me, and I mean to hold by my heart."

He had found, to quote the title of his famous article, "The Christian Trinity a practical Truth." "The whole sky" of his religious firmament, recently so dark, was "luminous about him"; and through this gateway of the feeling Bushnell entered into the freedom and the certainty of the Kingdom of God.

Dr. Bushnell's spiritual awakening was followed by a determination to exchange the law for the ministry, and by his entrance on Yale Divinity School, where he remained a student from 1831 to 1833. He sympathized little with the methods and mental attitude of its instructors, and was in turn regarded by them as of an odd cast of mind ; his own speculations sketched out the thoughts that were to grow into his theory of language, and his "Nature and the Supernatural"; but of positive impression from his divinity course there is little record. In February, 1833, he was invited to supply the pulpit of the North Church in Hartford, and this temporary engagement resulted, on May 22d of the same year, in his ordination to its pastorate. The establishment of these ecclesiastical relations was followed, in September, by his marriage to Mary Apthorp of New Haven,—a union of rare helpfulness and mutual sympathy.

For the first few years the young pastor's life was one of comparative outward peace, though of inward trial under the discipline of repeated bereavement, and the gradual development of that bronchial and pulmonary malady which was to render all his later years a hard-fought battle with disease. Under the burden of these experiences, and in the joys and sorrows of the pastorate, his spiritual nature broadened and deepened, and his preaching became of increasing power. Not an orator in the sense of dramatic effectiveness or emotional excitement, few men in the New England pulpit have equaled Dr. Bushnell in his ability to present Christian

truth in fresh and impressive guise, whether to the listener in the pew of a generation ago, or to the reader who follows his luminous pages now that his voice has been silent for more than a quarter of a century. Had Dr. Bushnell done nothing but give to the Anglo-Saxon religious public his three volumes of sermons, he would have been held in high repute among the leaders of New England. Freshness of presentation and impressiveness of thought were characteristic of him always,—as much in the first year of his ministry as in his maturer age. And he had a marvelous capacity to compress the argument of a discourse, whatever its theme, into a pithy and felicitous title. Such headings as "Every Man's Life a Plan of God," "The Capacity of Religion Extirpated by Disuse," "Duty not. Measured by our own Ability," "Living to God in Small Things," or "Barbarism the first Danger," not merely arrest attention. They stick in memory as sermons in epitome.

No less striking in their way are the long series of addresses on more secular themes which Dr. Bushnell began early in his ministry and continued while strength permitted. His "True Wealth or Weal of Nations" would be notable from the pen of any man of thirty-five. His "City Plans" and "Day of Roads" show his keen interest in all that made for the welfare of the community in which he lived. His "Work and Play" exhibits the old-fashioned academic "oration" at its best. His "Founders Great in their Unconsciousness" is a noble tribute to the makers of New England. But no loyal son or lover of this Commonwealth would readily surrender his masterly "Speech for Connecticut," or that finer tribute to the simple virtues and noble men and women of a century ago, his "Age of Homespun,"—a word-picture of unsurpassed vividness and truth. The earliest of these services won speedy recognition for the young Hartford minister, and the appreciation of his promise and worth found expressions in a call to the presidency of Middlebury College in 1840, and in the bestowment upon him of the degree of Doctor of Divinity by Wesleyan University two years later. But the strain of work gave opportunity for the invasion of disease, and after a tour to the South in search of health in the spring of 1845, Dr. Bushnell was forced to spend nearly a year in the same quest in Europe, returning to Hartford in June, 1846.

Almost immediately after his return from Europe, Dr. Bushnell wrote the two "Discourses on Christian Nurture", which led,

on their publication in 1847, to the first of the series of conflicts with which the noontide of his life was filled. That these "Discourses" should so stir the polemic blood of his ministerial brethren was neither intended nor anticipated by him. He was as unconscious of their consequences as was Luther when he nailed the theses to the door of the castle-church at Wittenberg ; but to understand their effect and to measure the subsequent contributions made by Dr. Bushnell to New England religious thought we must glance at the theological situation in which his early ministry was cast.

The great theological movement which began with Jonathan Edwards and was developed by his disciples had long dominated western New England and had driven Unitarian dissent out of Congregational fellowship in eastern Massachusetts. It had done a work for which we may be profoundly grateful. To the Edwardean movement we owe the initiation of home and foreign missions among our churches, the founding of theological seminaries, the revival of theology as a science, and especially the human instrumentalities in the awakening of the spiritual life of New England and the regions of the West that make the story of the first half of the nineteenth century one of refreshment and cheer when contrasted with the arid religious history of most of the century that went before. But the very strength and intensity of the Edwardean movement led to some weaknesses. Marked as it had always been by strenuous preaching of a conscious submission to the will of God as the only proper method of entrance on the Christian life, it made conversion essentially a conscious surrender, and emphasized the revival as the normal means of the increase of the church. It had not a little justification for its emphases in the religious history of New England, but they were over-emphases none the less.

Nor were the doctrinal discussions which Edwardeanism had brought to the front, important as they were, quite as fundamental as they seemed to the men of that age. Questions of natural or moral ability, of the relations of Adam's sin to the sinfulness of the race, of the extent of submission to the divine disposal needful before a man could entertain the Christian hope, or of the purpose of God in the permission of sin, however keenly debated, are not the most fundamental and abiding problems in religion. Already, by 1850, Christian thought in Germany and England was emphasizing, instead, questions as to the nature and work of Christ, the

authority of Scripture, and the bases of religious truth. Edwardianism had strenuously asserted the full divinity of Christ in opposition to Unitarianism ; but without any very fundamental discussion of the problem of His person. Driven from the Anselmic theory of the Atonement by the rise of early Calvinistic Universalism, it had adopted the much feebler Grotian or governmental interpretation of Christ's work ; while on the authority of Scripture or the source of religious truth it had nothing new to say, nor had these questions been raised by any of eminence among its leaders. Yet these problems that were beginning to demand attention across the ocean were sure eventually to come to New England. The interesting point is that many of them were to be brought to prominence by a son of New England soil who owed but slight debt to contemporary discussion elsewhere ; but who moved, by the insight of his genius, largely in the direction in which Christian thought was tending in Europe.

But a far greater limitation of New England religious thought generally than any that has been mentioned was bondage to the formalism of logical method and definition. What John Cotton said in the days of the founders might still be its motto :

“ Every shred of Gold hammered, or drawne out of the wedge of Gold, is as well Gold, as the whole lump and wedge. Whatsoever is drawn out of the Scripture by just consequence and deduction, is as well the word of God, as that which is an expresse Commandment or Example in Scripture.”

Certain theologic truth was thought deducible from isolated texts, by dialectic processes, akin to those used in the demonstrations of mathematics. The verities of religion were deemed capable of as exact, and as essentially intellectual, definition as the problems of geometry. These principles trained a race of giant wrestlers. What men of strength the names, Edwards, Bellamy, Hopkins, Emmons, Taylor, and Tyler, recall ! But they tended to magnify intellectual differences in the apprehension of Christian theology into barriers scarcely to be passed. Within the common Edwardian heritage, in the years of Bushnell's early ministry, division had led to the foundation at East Windsor of a Seminary, planted largely to oppose the supposed heresies of Yale as to the extent to which God might have prevented the admission of sin to the universe, and both New Haven and East Windsor, and Andover

too, looked askance at Oberlin with its hope of a realization of a sinless life on earth.

These divergencies were not held in any spirit of charity. They could not be, for each contestant proceeded to apply the principles of logic to his opponent's position and drew forth inferences of the most disquieting sort as necessarily bound up in that opponent's errors. Thus, to cite an example or two, no less a man than Prof. Nathaniel W. Taylor declared concerning the view entertained by Dr. Bennet Tyler regarding the divine permission of sin: "This theory, if carried out into its legitimate consequences, leads to Universalism, to Infidelity and to Atheism." Dr. Tyler was no less convinced that the opinions taught by Dr. Taylor "tend to sap the foundation of the Gospel, and that if not checked in their progress, they will lead to fundamental error." "Such was the field of theologic discussion into which Dr. Bushnell came as a fresh force, criticising many of its accepted beliefs, and denying the validity of its formal logical methods of seeking to define truth. Yet with the piety of that older school,—and its piety was conspicuous,—Dr. Bushnell always felt in heartiest fellowship. "I had a peculiar sympathy with the style of piety in the Old School brethren," — Dr. Bushnell said, in reviewing the first twenty years of his pastorate, — "I loved their deep-drawn sentiments, and the sense of God that reverberated in their Christian expressions. I was drawn to their prayers, and to them personally by their prayers."

Dr. Bushnell's "Christian Nurture" attacked the current theory which viewed a conscious change as essential to a normal conversion, and opposed less obviously, though not less really, the individualism and the extreme emphasis on revivals characteristic of the period. Over against this teaching it emphasized the value of family training. His argument, in his own words, was, "That the child should grow up a Christian", to which he added the further phrase, in a later presentation of the theme: "and never know himself as being otherwise."

"In other words," he continued, "the aim, effort, and expectation should be, not, as is commonly assumed, that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age, but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years."

Dr. Bushnell was quite right in saying "this doctrine is not a novelty". His emphasis on the "organic unity" of a Christian family, is emphasis essentially upon the covenant relationship taught by the founders of New England; but he now put his argument in a very fresh, original, and modern way. However fundamentally accordant with early New England teaching, it was a radical break with the prevalent Edwardean theories. And in a way which no New England thinking, whether Edwardean or pre-Edwardean had anticipated, it identified the natural and the supernatural as but different sides of one divine order. New England theology had held them apart; and it is not surprising that the leaders at East Windsor and New Haven alike attacked the writer of so disturbing a volume. Dr. Tyler, in a letter that had the unanimous approval of those present at a meeting of the Hartford North Association, urged in reply, "that the child should grow up a Christian, it is necessary that he should become a Christian." Others held that Dr. Bushnell's argument was merely naturalistic and such as a religious-minded Deist might offer; and it was clear to all that a considerable modification of then current views of human depravity and of the operation of the divine Spirit on the human will were involved in it. In no small degree, however, Dr. Bushnell's thoughts on the development of the Christian life were the proper fruitage of his own home training. He replied to his critics, before the close of 1847, in a forceful pamphlet embodying a good deal of historic investigation and not a little keen argument; but his best vindication has been the flight of time. At the present day no view advocated by Dr. Bushnell has won so wide acceptance among the churches or theological schools of our order as that set forth in his "Christian Nurture."

The hum of debate aroused by "Christian Nurture" had not died away when Dr. Bushnell was plunged, almost it seemed to him by a divine impulse beyond his own control, into a much keener controversy. The month of February, 1848, brought him a most remarkable spiritual experience. Urged to the search for a fuller Christian life than he had yet known by reading Upham's "Life . . . of Madame Guyon with some Account of the . . . Religious Opinions of Fénelon," which had just been published, he awoke one early winter morning to what seemed to him a vision of the Gospel in its reality, a "clearer knowledge of God" than he had ever had before. Account for it as we may, and make any

allowance that may be needful in recognition of the marvelous kindling power of his spiritual imagination to generate into life seed-thoughts derived from his reading, no one can doubt the reality of his experience or its power over him. Thenceforward he looked upon it as an entrance into a knowledge of God such as he had not before possessed. But he looked upon it no less as a command to give forth his new-found light to men. To him it seemed a prophetic call; and when, a month later, an invitation came to him to address the Unitarian Divinity School at Harvard, and it became also his duty, by appointment of this Association, to preach the *Concio ad Clerum* at Yale, with the "Divinity of Christ" as its theme, and further summons came to him to address the students in Andover Seminary, these repeated and unusual invitations appeared to him so many divine calls to make known to others what he believed God had shown to him. The result was three notable addresses, to which he prefixed a "Dissertation on the Nature of Language," as necessary for their comprehension, and published in 1849, under the title, "God in Christ."

Nothing would be more incorrect than to regard Dr. Bushnell's "Dissertation on Language" as a remote or unpractical speculation. On the contrary it was his justification for his criticism of contemporary New England theology, and the starting point of his own constructive work. It has been truly described by his earliest and most intimate biographer as the "key to his thought", and Dr. Munger has well said that "his entrance into the company of New England theologians with such a theory was like Copernicus appearing among the Ptolemaists." To his thinking, the effort of theology to define the exact content of religious truth in precise logical formulas was an attempt to achieve the impossible, since language could have no such power. All language, he held, is divisible into two departments—a physical and an intellectual. In the lower department, words are names for objects designated; in the higher, they are more or less imperfect symbols of the intellectual or spiritual realities they typify. Hence, no formula of words can ever exactly measure a spiritual truth. It can express that truth more or less adequately; but it cannot wholly compass it. "Can the Christian truth", asks Dr. Bushnell, "be offered in the molds of any dogmatic statement? What is the Christian truth? Preëminently and principally it is the expression of God—God coming into expression through histories and rites, through

an incarnation, and through language—in one syllable, by the word.” And he finds the chief fault in the theological situation of his day to be that :—

“It has not been held, as a practical, positive, and earnest Christian truth, that there is a PERCEPTIVE POWER in spiritual life . . . an immediate experimental knowledge of God by virtue of which, and partly in the degree of which, Christian theology is possible. No real doubt has been held of the perfect sufficiency of formulas ; or of natural logic, handled by natural understanding, to settle them.”

It need hardly be pointed out that this insistence on the appeal of Christianity to the ethical and religious feelings has a very modern sound, and is in large measure in harmony in principle, though not in detail, with tendencies wholly independent of Dr. Bushnell which appear in the Ritschlian school of German theology at the present day.

These principles underlie the three significant discourses of 1848 to which their statement forms the introduction, and with them were combined some hints derived from an essay by the great German theologian, Schleiermacher, on the Sabellian and Athanasian theories of the Trinity, which Prof. Moses Stuart had translated and published in 1835—hints which in Dr. Bushnell's mind were but germs for much larger development. Dr. Bushnell strives throughout to set forth the spiritual realities of which their verbal statements are but the imperfect expression. Christ is the manifestation of God. With almost Patristic insistence Dr. Bushnell affirms of Christ: “He is in such a sense God, or God manifested, that the unknown term of his nature, that which we are most in doubt of, and about which we are least capable of any positive affirmation, is the human.” But it is to the heart rather than to the intellect that the incarnation speaks. Intellectually it is surrounded with difficulties through the limitations essentially involved in the manifestation of divinity under human conditions. Yet Dr. Bushnell exclaims :—

“God ; God is what we want, not a man ; God, revealed through man, that we may see His Heart, and hide our guilty nature in the bosom of His love ; God so identified with our race as to signify the possible union and eternal identification of our nature with His.”

Whether its metaphysics be regarded as adequate or not, here was a conception of the incarnation that appealed powerfully to Christian experience.

In a similar way Dr. Bushnell strove to grasp the spiritual reality behind the logical formulas in which the Trinity was presented. What God may be in the depths of His infinite existence, he affirms, we cannot say, save that "we are to have it for a fixed, first truth, that God is, in the most perfect and rigid sense, one being." His manifestations as Father, Son, and Spirit are "instrumentally three — three simply as related to our finite apprehension and the communication of God's incommunicable nature." This was indeed a modified Sabellianism. It made the Trinity a Trinity of revelation. But its statement undoubtedly brought a sense of profound relief to many who were perplexed by the metaphysical explanations of the Trinity, yet whose Christian consciousness recognized the divinity of the Son and of the Spirit no less than that of the Father. It was a real service to claim the doctrine of the Trinity for the realm of Christian experience rather than that of Christian dogma and speculation.

But Dr. Bushnell went yet further in this weighty series of discourses. He discussed Christ's atoning work. New England in his day generally accepted the governmental view of the atonement which had been set forth by the younger Jonathan Edwards in 1785, and was essentially that of Grotius. That view looked upon the great sacrifice as a tribute to "general justice", a demonstration of the value God places on His own laws. No view, save those which deny the reality of an atonement altogether, is so empty of personal significance as this governmental hypothesis. The atonement as interpreted by it becomes a prudential device by which God is enabled to forgive without dishonor to His own government. But the fundamental conception of the Gospel in this matter is that Christ died *for me*. His work must have some more positive and personal value for *me* than expression of abhorrence for sin or honor to general law. That personal relation the Anselmic theory maintained, though in a way increasingly unsatisfactory to the thought of the Church, by asserting that Christ paid the penalty for my personal sins. The same personal relation Dr. Bushnell now sought to explain in an interpretation of the atonement which makes it the expression of God's outreaching attitude of love toward me, designed to draw me to Him and lead me to regard sin and holiness from His point of view. It is an expression of love which brings the believer into a spiritual, reciprocal,

relation with Christ from which the new life flows. Dr. Bushnell thus describes his view: —

“My doctrine is summarily this: that, excluding all thoughts of a penal quality in the life and death of Christ, or of any divine abhorrence to sin exhibited by sufferings laid upon his person; also dismissing, as an assumption too high for us, the opinion that the death of Christ is designed for some governmental effect on the moral empire of God in other worlds,—excluding points like these, and regarding everything done by him as done for expression before us, and thus for effect in us, he does produce an impression in our minds of the essential sanctity of God’s law and character, which it was needful to produce, and without which any proclamation of pardon would be dangerous, any attempt to subdue and reconcile us to God ineffectual.”

No wonder that a book that broke with current New England theology on so many points drew at once the fire of criticism from all sides. The theological schools of New England and their Presbyterian neighbors were prompt in expressing their dissent. A few voices, notable among which was that of Rev. Amos S. Chesebrough, D.D., then of Chester, Conn., whom we rejoice to have with us today, were raised in his defense. But opposition soon took the form of a demand for Dr. Bushnell’s discipline. To the honor of the Congregational ministry be it said, that the spirit of fair play,—rather let us say of Christian charity;—was so manifested by those in a position to visit ecclesiastical censure upon him, most of whom were far from sympathizing with his opinions, that he passed unscathed through all his perils. On the whole, considering the time and the school of thinking then prevalent, the episode is very creditable to our ecclesiastical system. Dr. Bushnell could well describe them as “days of accusation.” They were days of harassment and anxiety; but fortunately they were never days of condemnation.

The Hartford Central Association, of which Dr. Bushnell was a member, had been formed in 1843, when the Old Hartford North Association had been divided at the request of Dr. Bennet Tyler and his friends, for geographical and theological considerations; a division that Dr. Tyler must often have regretted in the light of subsequent events, since it placed Dr. Bushnell beyond the reach of his opponents. That Association carefully examined his disputed volume, and on October 23, 1849, by a vote of seventeen to three declared him not “properly or justly subjected to a charge of heresy.” From this position the Hartford Central Association

never receded ; but other Associations desired radical action, notably the Association of Fairfield West. That body sought to influence the General Association of 1849 to take up the case ; but the General Association very properly held that such questions of discipline belonged to the jurisdiction of the local association of which the accused was a member. Fairfield West then addressed the Hartford Central Association directly in remonstrance, and receiving no satisfaction, appealed to the General Association at its meeting at Litchfield, in June, 1850. Here Dr. Bushnell was himself present, and his calm fortitude contributed not a little to the result, which was virtually a declination on the part of the General Association to interfere in the case. But the Association of Fairfield West did not abandon its campaign. In June, 1852, it was once more before the General Association, this time met at Danbury. Once more and decisively, the General Association declined to interfere. But Dr. Bushnell's church, fearing that the requisite three members might be found in it who could bring their pastor to trial before the Consociation, by their complaint — a fear that seems to have been really groundless — now voted without dissent, on June 27, 1852, to withdraw from the Hartford North Consociation of which it had been a member. All real danger of a trial for heresy was now past, though the Association of Fairfield West did not realize the futility of its effort till it had vainly besieged the General Association in 1853 and 1854.

Nothing was more conspicuous in this long struggle than Dr. Bushnell's calmness of mind, a serenity due largely to the conviction of a divinely appointed duty with which he had begun the publication which had led to so acrimonious debate. It was this comparative peace of mind that enabled him to turn his attention to such unruffled and lofty addresses as those on "The Founders Great in their Unconsciousness," the "Speech for Connecticut" or "The Age of Homespun," which were the product of the most harassed of these years. But he read and studied not a little on the doctrines round which the controversy waged ; and the result was not merely the publication of an elaborate defense in 1851, under the title "Christ in Theology," but some modification in his views, especially regarding the Trinity. While even more convinced than before that the current New England theory was untenable, he discovered with what he declared to be "a most refreshing surprise," in how large degree he was in sympathy with

the Athanasian position as developed at the Council of Nicæa. And three years later, in his article on "The Christian Trinity a Practical Truth," he moved yet further in the direction of conformity with historic orthodoxy, holding that God is "eternally threeing himself. . . . In some high sense indefinable, he is datelessly and eternally becoming three." Dr. Bushnell's particular interpretation of the Trinity, and his modifications of view regarding it, are, however, relatively unimportant. The great fact is that he sought to take the doctrine out of the realm of intellectual speculation into that of Christian experience and to find its essence in the truth "that God is a being practically related to his creatures."

These tempestuous years, though met with a resolute courage that gave leisure of mind not merely for such notable public addresses as have been described, but for the great service of securing the park that bears his name in the city of his residence, could not but rack a physical frame enfeebled by disease. Late in 1854 Dr. Bushnell broke down with persistent bronchitis; and, after a vain search for health in Cuba and the South, returned to Hartford in May, 1855, able to say nothing more hopeful of his condition than that he "rather expected to get well." Through the remaining months of 1855 he was able to do little but work as his scanty strength permitted on his new volume, "Nature and the Supernatural"; and in March, 1856, he went to California, hoping to find benefit in a radical change of climate. Here he threw himself with his accustomed zeal and with an energy which many a man in health might envy, into effort for laying the religious and educational foundations of the forming community. By published sermons and printed descriptions and appeals he sought to promote California's welfare. He was offered the presidency of the college — now University — of California; and, though he did not fully enter on the office, he did great service to an institution which he described as "yet to be created," not the least of his contributions being the selection of the site of its present habitation at Berkeley, — a selection that was not adopted by the trustees till after he left California.

Dr. Bushnell's attachment to his Hartford parish was strong; and, as soon as improvement in health seemed to warrant it, he returned to Hartford, reaching home in January, 1857. By February following, he was able to say to a correspondent: "My

book is now ready for the press ;" and, early in 1858, his first volume of sermons, the "Sermons for the New Life," was put forth, and met a reception from the public in gratifying contrast to the stormy greeting of his "God in Christ." Near the close of the same year he published the volume which had cost him more labor than any other he ever wrote, that entitled "Nature and the Supernatural." The subject had been in his mind certainly since he was a student in the Divinity School. It is evident that the germ out of which his volume grew was a brief passage in those "Aids to Reflection" by which the mind of Coleridge so impressed the forming intellect of Dr. Bushnell. And the purpose of the book was an eminently desirable one. Dr. Bushnell attempted, as he declares, "to find a legitimate place for the supernatural in the system of God, and show it as a necessary part of the divine system itself." To his thinking :

"Nature is that world of substance, whose laws are laws of cause and effect, and whose events transpire, in orderly succession, under those laws ; the supernatural is that range of substance, if any such there be, that acts upon the chain of cause and effect in nature from without the chain, producing, thus, results that by mere nature could not come to pass. It is not said, be it observed, as is sometimes done, that the supernatural implies a suspension of the laws of nature, a causing them for the time not to be,—that perhaps, is never done—it is only said that we as powers, not in the line of cause and effect, can set the causes in nature at work, in new combinations otherwise never occurring, and produce, by our action upon nature, results which she, as nature, could never produce by her own internal acting."

Man himself is thus, in a "tier of existences," a supernatural being. The natural and the supernatural are not mutually exclusive, they are not hostile, together they constitute the one system of God. Doubtless, the growth of the doctrine of evolution has rendered obsolete much of Dr. Bushnell's argument ; but its general trend is in the direction in which modern theology has moved, emphasizing the divine immanence, and showing that the spiritual and the natural combine in the commonest ongoing of every-day life no less than in the great progress of redemption. With this fundamental contention Dr. Bushnell combined a fresh and vivid discussion of sin, redemption, the person of Christ and miracles, a discussion of least value, possibly, where he attempts to show by illustration the present existence of miracles, and that reaches its highest plane of argument, and of eloquence alike, in his contention

that "The Character of Jesus forbids His possible Classification with Men."

The volume just described had been written under much physical limitation; and the reaction on its completion was followed by a physical collapse so serious that it seemed hopeless to Dr. Bushnell to attempt to continue a pastorate which had already been so interrupted. Accordingly, he resigned his charge in April, 1859, and preached a pathetic farewell sermon on the third of July following. This severance of ties was most reluctantly accepted by his people, and a gift of \$10,000 to the retiring pastor testified to their affection. But Dr. Bushnell had struck the roots of his being too deep into Hartford soil to be long away from the community in which, well or ill, he was so conspicuous and useful a citizen. After a long winter in the bracing climate of Minnesota, and a summer and winter at Clifton Springs, during which he rewrote and greatly enlarged his "Christian Nurture," he returned to Hartford in the spring of 1861, not to leave the city again save for summer sojournings in the Adirondacks, in Vermont, or other comparatively brief excursions, till his death, on February 17, 1876. These years of patient endurance of physical disability he well described as of "broken industry." They were years of honor, sweetened by household affection, by the loving reverence of his younger associates in the Hartford ministry, and the increasing good-will of many — nay, of most — of those who had been his opponents in his days of conflict. But if their industry was broken, it was still eminently productive. He preached often. He wrote many articles for the periodical press. He delivered a noble oration at Yale in commemoration of her soldier dead. He published a volume of essays, in 1868, on "The Moral Uses of Dark Things," and two collections of sermons, one in 1864, and the other in 1872 — volumes as characteristic of the man as any he ever wrote. The chief significance of this period in his career as a religious thinker lies, however, in his volume of 1866, entitled "The Vicarious Sacrifice Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation," and its sequel of 1874, bearing the title "Forgiveness and Law Grounded in Principles Interpreted by Human Analogies." Here he took up in ampler treatment the great theme of the Atonement, which he had already discussed in his "God in Christ."

To Dr. Bushnell's thinking, as expounded in the earlier of these

volumes, "love is a principle essentially vicarious in its own nature, identifying the subject with others, so as to suffer their adversities and pains, and taking on itself the burden of their evils." All love really worthy of the name, whether in God or man, strives to share and to take on itself in helpful sympathy the sufferings and sins of the objects of its affection. This principle is universal. "Given the universality of love, the universality of vicarious sacrifice is given also. Here is the center and deepest spot of good, or goodness, conceivable. At this point we look into heaven's eye itself, and read the meaning of all heavenly grace." Dr. Bushnell, that is, strives to show that the atonement is no mysteriously incomprehensible transaction, nor is it a forensic or governmental work; but that it is simply the highest illustration by God himself of the vicarious principle which is inseparable from all real love everywhere; and that the object of Christ's sacrifice is "the healing of souls" by the cure of fallen character. This healing power comes through the sacrifice of Christ, for the incarnate life and vicarious death of Christ "humanize God to men," and show men that what Christ has done for them they, in their small measure, ought to be willing to do for their fellows.

But though Dr. Bushnell thus made the moral influence of the atonement its central fact and its life-giving power, he did not deny its relation to the righteousness of God,—though in his "Vicarious Sacrifice" he makes that relationship subordinate. "Christ," he there affirmed, "has set the law precept in a position of great honor and power . . . all that he does and suffers in his sacrifice, he as truly does for the resanctification of the law as for our recovery." This side of the discussion had its fuller illustration in his last book, "Forgiveness and Law," which he published eight years later than his "Vicarious Sacrifice," and designed as a substitute for the second half of the older work. In this volume Dr. Bushnell so maintained a godward and propitiatory aspect of the atonement that, though he declared "I still assert the 'moral view' of the atonement as before, and even more completely than before", his volume seemed to many a return to conceptions of an older day which he had before discarded. Yet his theory was far from being the old one of a sacrifice to satisfy justice. In forgiveness something more than sympathy with the offender he deems to be necessary. The soul that truly forgives another suffers for and with the offender, and by that very suffer-

ing is reconciled or propitiated toward the sinner. So God Himself, by His great sacrifice which He has made for man in Christ, is propitiated and inclined toward gracious feelings manward. Ingenious as the speculation is, it has won far less assent than Dr. Bushnell's conception of the atonement as a life-giving moral force. But the volume, written, the author declared, in response to "the unexpected arrival of fresh light," is an interesting illustration of his openness of mind even to old age. To such a spirit the visions of that world where we see no more through a glass darkly, but know as we are known, must be a joy unspeakable.

Dr. Bushnell was not a theologian in the sense in which that other great son of Connecticut, Jonathan Edwards, was a theologian. He had no desire to be. He wrought out no close-argued logical system. He believed none possible, and he regarded it as the chief evil of contemporary theology that men had made the endeavor. He founded no school in the technical sense. No party among us calls itself by his name. But he had a poet's fire of imagination, and a prophet's perception of the reality of God. He strove to reach back beyond the formulas in which his contemporaries believed Christian truth to be absolutely defined, to the greater spiritual verities which they and he alike felt, but which he regarded their formulas as merely symbolizing and oftentimes misrepresenting. He moved by the strong impulse of original and constructive genius along lines which Christian thought in other lands has to a considerable extent been traversing, and in this progress he owed not a little to the work of others, but far more was original with him. He sought to make the presentation of Christianity simpler and more natural. And for all these reasons he has been increasingly a power in religious thinking among us. His work has touched and strengthened and broadened many a mind that has been unable to accept his presentations of truth in their fullness. His has been a great influence. He has made easy for many the transition from the older to the newer conceptions of the Christian faith. To him in no small measure it is due that the changes through which our New England theology has gone in these latter days have been relatively so peacefully accomplished. As we think of him today we may fittingly borrow the phrase engraved below his portrait chiseled in memorial marble on the wall before you, and call to loving remembrance "his great genius, his great character, and his great service to mankind."

THE SECRET OF HORACE BUSHNELL

BY THEODORE T. MUNGER

The truest thing to be said of Horace Bushnell is what Harnack said of Luther: "He liberated the natural life, and the natural order of things."

In quoting this remark, I would emphasize the word *natural*, and the point I would make is, that the ultimate ground of Bushnell's thought, the secret and law of it, is to be found in his relation to *nature*, — using the word in its largest sense.

It is not necessary to raise the question how it happened that he was keyed to nature in this fundamental way and kept so true to its note. Or, if we attempt an answer, we may go to the realm of nature itself for an analogy if not an answer. Nature is always breaking out into surprises under slight changes of environment. The seeds of genius and greatness are wide-sown, and as by a blind hand. Heredity grows every day more mysterious. We no longer inherit only the qualities of parents or grandsires. As true it may be that the marked thing in us dates a score of generations back. That unspeakable mystery named life is not diluted; it may lie hidden — waiting its opportunity — until at last it blossoms and lets out its hidden beauty or power. As we think of Bushnell's birth, a hundred years ago, into the sternest of the New England life, we marvel how his mind ever began to unfold in free and natural ways. But when God calls a man for a special work he provides ways to make the election sure. First of all, he had the endowment — another mystery of our being, — a little more from the open hand of the Creator, a fiber spun more finely, an eye with keener and broader vision, a heart that throbs with stronger beat; we call it genius. What genius will do, or where it will go, there is no telling. In Bushnell's case it drove him to nature in the special form of observing its laws and getting at its methods, and above all, by entering into sympathy with these laws and methods. Bred in the fresh, free air of Litchfield, where every cloud and stream and hill spoke of nature to his brooding soul, and every

day's task in field or shop was packed full of laws that struck a chord to which thought responded; touched in deeper ways by every mention of God;—thus bred, and charged to the full with all that nature could breathe into him, he came down to Yale, where thought inevitably started question, and question inevitably begot doubt; for everybody who thought questioned, and happy was he who did not doubt and deny. In short, Bushnell found himself in the world of theology. The time was over when day was bound to day by natural piety, and the day had come when, instead, he heard only disputes, and arguments, and doctrines hammered into or out of shape on the anvil of logic. What wonder that early visions of God faded out, and — between hard work in college and preaching that chiefly bred only denial — he fell away into a sort of numbness of soul, or, when roused to thought, he thought only to deny and reject?

So it was until a crisis came and action was forced upon him with great struggles of soul, when the angel of his nature came to him and taught him to say: "My heart wants the Father; my heart wants the Son; my heart wants the Holy Ghost — and one just as much as the other." This was not an echo from Schleiermacher, nor was it borne in upon him from the mystics. He was dealing with himself in a strictly natural way; even Scripture seemed not to influence him; he was left alone with his own nature, and followed its dictate.

This early experience is outlined in his "Moral Uses of Dark Things", where he says: "We learn about nature by going directly to nature herself, putting our ear to her voices, observing her changes with our eyes." "God wants to have us go directly to the subjects of duty — all subjects of a moral and spiritual nature — and learn what they are from themselves. Too much report and talk would ruin us; we should never know anything *first-hand*" — an incessant phrase with Bushnell — "if we were all the while obtruded upon by revelations of message and story. Real conviction goes before talk, and is grounded in the soul's own thinking of subjects and questions themselves." Here is Bushnell at the outset — himself entering the open door of the Kingdom of God, by steps pointed out through the play of his own nature as it is moved upon by the Spirit of God. The most marked thing in him is his fidelity to this habit — continuous, inflexible, dominant, and decisive. Whatever the question or subject — spiritual or

material, theological or political, personal or civic — he plunged at once into the depths of its nature, never staying on the surface longer than to name it; and when he had found out its elements, its relations and action, he emerged with a principle, a truth, a conviction, or a method in his hand ready for use. So it was from first to last. This search, and the method of it, was, for the most part, conducted by himself alone. "First-hand" was his watch-word. He was criticised for over self-confidence — conceit it was sometimes called. Bushnell was not conceited, — but he was immensely self-reliant, and there had been begotten in him a tremendous sense of power — two things then greatly needed. At no time in the history of our New England theology was there so much bewilderment and contradiction as when he came upon the stage. Far back, or down deep in the body of orthodoxy, there had been a fatal mistake over the very nature of man. Some sense of it was felt, and with it the necessity of correcting it. Hence the age of *improvement*, as it was gently termed. To save the churches and the faith was the one thought of all earnest minds. It was not merely a lust for theologizing — a contagious disease indeed — nor personal forth-putting that led to their various theories and distinctions. They were mending their house, not tearing down and building anew, and every man had a board, a window, or a door that he thought would conduce to the improvement. The greatness of their mistake should only deepen the pathos with which we look back upon it from today. Bushnell seems to have been the only man who measured and felt it as it was. He was caught between the upper and nether millstones of the contending schools and was bruised, though not ground to powder, between them. His sympathies may have been more strongly with one side than the other, but his theology and his method belonged to neither. In 1851, when already past middle life — stung beyond endurance not only by treatment of himself but by a full realization of the wretched condition into which theology had fallen — he put out a volume, now rare, entitled "Christ in Theology." In some respects it is the most brilliant of his books. There is here no loitering — as often was the case — as if loath to leave his thought, — brilliant, sententious, and always with a splendid sense of strength and vitality, a rushing torrent from title page to colophon, — carrying out to sea a great deal of disjointed lumber — not to say rubbish — and leaving the up-

country in a much healthier and more peaceful condition. But it is also a sad book. The page in which this theological chaos is described is as true as it is graphic. It also has the value of showing that he had an interior knowledge of New England theology, and only too well understood to what end it was paving the way: "To see brought up in distinct array before us the multitudes of leaders, and schools, and theologic wars of only the century past, — the Supralapsarians and Sublapsarians; the Arminianizers and the true Calvinists; the Pelagians and Augustinians; the Tasters and the Exercisers; Exercisers by divine efficiency and by human self-efficiency; the love-to-being-in-general virtue, the willing-to-be-damned virtue, and the love-to-one's-greatest-happiness virtue; no ability, all ability, and moral and natural ability distinguished; disciples by the new-creating act of Omnipotence, and by change of the governing purpose; atonement by punishment and by expression; limited and general; by imputation and without imputation; trinitarians of a threefold distinction, of three psychologic persons, or of three sets of attributes; under a unity of oneness, or of necessary agreement, or of society and deliberative council: nothing, I think, would more certainly disenchant us of our confidence in systematic orthodoxy, and the possibility in human language of an exact theologic science, than an exposition so practical and serious, and withal so indisputably mournful, — so mournfully indisputable."

When we look back on this chaos of conflicting opinions that often aspired to the dignity of doctrines, and upon the way in which Bushnell strove to escape from it, we are reminded of the legend that in the first days of creation some of the greater angels came down to earth to see what was going on, and returned saying, there was danger lest dear old chaos be overturned to make way for this new and dreadful idea of cosmos, and — worst of all — by natural law.

As metaphysics seemed to lie at the bottom of this sweltering chaos — and certainly it was its vehicle — he turned fiercely upon it: "Metaphysics have never established anything. The last new teacher is always about to do it, and the coterie gathered about him are quite certain that he has; but it turns out very shortly that he has rather multiplied the questions than settled any of them." Nothing could be truer so far as it relates to the multiplication of diverse doctrines. Every variation had been ham-

mered out on that anvil. Bushnell did not speak vaguely. The theological schools were in his eye, and their students were educated on the very matter that bred and fed their conflicts. What wonder that when nurtured on stones they should continue to hurl them? Bushnell revolted at the outset; he was from the first dominated by another way of thinking. He drank from other fountains, and fed on other food, and saw with different eyes. He never approached a subject in the dialectic way, but always through the nature of the thing involved: What are its laws? how is it composed? what are its relations? how does it act? It was this that made him so interesting and often fascinating as a writer; not that he gives you new facts, for sometimes he is lacking in attainable data and occasionally he goes astray in them, yet how charmingly he discourses, and how many things he points out that are true and are not to be found elsewhere! Any good botanist can tell us more than we find in that most vital essay, "Life, or the Lives", but it takes more than a botanist to make us feel that "this boundless wave of Life is, in some high sense, a wave of joy"; and that "if you leave the soul out of an organized thing, all analysis of it is a kind of analytic murder."

Bushnell's plain speaking led to criticism. From every quarter — Princeton, New Haven, East Windsor, Boston, and Bangor — came the charge of *naturalism*, a true and fatal charge if Bushnell meant by nature what his critics meant. It is not strange the first and heaviest criticism was made at this point. His divergence from his brethren was wide and radical; they differed as to the very nature of creation; their worlds were not the same.

But whatever was Bushnell's view of nature and however he came by it, he did not go to nature for the sake of easy thinking nor to escape the uncertainty of metaphysics. Bushnell proposed to take the deepest possible plunge into them — even into the heart of nature itself — its heights as well as its depths. But nature is not an open page that he who runs may read. It is eternal and endless mystery. We never go far before we are forced to stop and say — *God*, and that only. And what are we doing today but asking if we have gone far enough in any direction to find solid ground? Robinson's great saying has broadened, and while we still look for more light to break out of God's Holy Word, we are also looking into that larger word — the Logos — the whole spoken word of God whose accents are ever falling on

attentive ears. Here, at least, Bushnell went, finding — as he believed — certainty because, as he contended in his very first thesis, “Nature is a system in which everything fulfills its end.”

Bushnell was abundantly charged with being illogical. If by logic is meant a formal logic, a propositional and syllogistic logic (of which Jowett said that it is neither a science nor an art but a dodge), doubtless the charge was true. But this is not real logic. Logic is the agreement of things; realities with other realities, not the agreement of words about them, and these words hemmed as to their meaning by definition. Logic is the true recognition of nature. It is the recognition of the universe and all things and processes in it as one system. Bushnell's logic was of this sort — the logic of a universal and infinite oneness. Thus he found his way into a valid theism, and escaped its fatal enemy, dualism. His logic and his theism form an endless chain that plays between nature, as we term it, and God. The motion is endless; the links are forged by God's hand — links but not fetters, holding God and man together in human freedom and yet in eternal necessity; insoluble mystery! but it means order and oneness; anything different is chaos.

If we were to take up Bushnell's treatises in order, we should find what we have called his *secret* underlying each one and the soul of it; each is an appeal to nature in its great sense. Take his theory of language as stated in the introduction to “God in Christ.” Criticism, not yet ended and often bordering on contempt, has been heaped upon it. Nor is it strange. It was like making a new alphabet. What wonder that men who wrote and taught by definition scouted it? In no respect is the difference between Bushnell and his critics so wide as at this point. It is to the lasting honor of his genius that, almost before he had traced a line in the way of a treatise — as if foreseeing what tasks of high import lay before him — he wrought out this theory, the fundamental thought of which is, that words are but symbols or shadows or hints of the things named; these lie behind the words — spiritual realities that can only be suggested by names drawn from material things; names that suggest but do not define nor compass. Rev. E. M. Chapman has recently well described it as “a declaration against the tyranny of set phrase.” It is indeed an inconvenient theory for those who imprison thought within words; but for poets and common people and all who use lan-

guage naturally, and for the ordinary exchange of thought and feeling, it is the theory that ordinary people and also extraordinary people, like Shakespeare and Wordsworth and Tennyson, will always use. In adopting it Bushnell did not ambush himself in order to shoot and escape returning shots, but simply to get into the natural language of the world ; nor would he break the bond between natural expression and the subtlest thought, because it possibly might let in uncertainty.

We see the same thing in his "Christian Nurture." This great book can be looked at in many ways — theological, ecclesiastical, civic, and domestic — but its emphasis certainly rests on the family ; and nowhere is nature so imperative and so strict in its laws as here. One who overlooks this misses the meaning of the book. With Bushnell *Christian Nurture* was, from first to last, a question of nature. It was the unnaturalness of the treatment of children by the churches of the day that fixed his attention and called out his protest. Every law of child-nature was violated. Their nature was wronged, twisted out of shape, and inverted in all its processes. Instead of their angels beholding the face of their Father in heaven, they were children of wrath, with the implication of its decreed fulfillment hanging over their cradles, and with no means for escape except through the fervors of chance revivals. The whole matter was a denial of human instincts in their most sacred relations. The horror of it was relieved only by its sincerity and the agony of parental hearts that often rebelled against it. It is an old saying that Calvinism breaks down when it comes to children — a saying justified by the recent attempt to upbuild it by changes at that point. Bushnell broke into this chaos of systematic theology by demanding simply a natural treatment of the child, placing him once more in the arms of the Saviour, and thence back into the home for Christian nurture.

Of course, by its very terms, nature is the main feature of "Nature and the Supernatural." Here his central thought had full play ; not nature in its usual restricted sense — as with the naturalist who stays within its form and process — but nature as comprising these, and going beyond into universal being, even God who is included in its category. Bushnell could go in no other path but this. He could not think except as his mind ran along some natural channel. He could see nothing but law and its processes ; even the free play of man's mind and will and the behests

of the Almighty were in a *supra* but not *contra* natural world. By this extension of nature he escaped necessity and found freedom as a son of God, and miracles became natural. "The being of God is a kind of law to his working," as he says, quoting the great Hooker. This book is usually regarded as the most thorough of his works. Exception may be taken to this view. There are chapters that might well be left out — so far off the track are they, and so tinged with outworn dogma and credulous testimony. Taking the treatise as a whole, nothing more central or more fundamental came from him than its main contention that nature and the supernatural form the one system of God. It is a kind of Copernican truth, embracing heaven and earth, and magnificently lodged in the minds of a generation that had not even dreamed it. However the tides of theological thought may flow, let science assert or deny what it must, this truth, like gravitation itself, remains unshaken and immovable. The ultimate dread of the theologians of the day was pantheism; deism was next door to it, and Bushnell's naturalism was held to pave the way along this *decensus Averni*. They were not protesting against trifles nor "counting the steps of fleas," and Bushnell took special pains to guard against the imputation by ample denial and explanation. "It is not the supernatural submitting itself to nature to be buried and lost, but going down to hook itself in upon nature by seizing on the analogies of thought and law, so to become fast locked in all the terms of experience and opinion which thought has generated. The bent we are thus receiving more and more distinctly towards nature and science is not wholly mischievous, as many appear to assume in their nervous dread of naturalism, but is our instinctive endeavor to obtain a new anchorage ground for Christian truth and ideas, where they will hold us more firmly and yield us a more settled confidence."

He speaks to the same effect in the essay, "Life, or the Lives":

"Things above sense, the reverend mysteries of God and religion, now throng about the man, firing his imagination, and challenging a ready faith. Having passed within the rind of matter, and by its mechanical laws, and discovered there a more potent, multitudinous, self-active world of life, his higher affinities are wakened, drawing him away to the common Father, whose life is in him, as in them, and to those meditations of the future otherwise faint and dim in their evidence."

These two passages are autobiographic as well as prophetic. He was himself an embodied realization of his own words,—“Na-

ture and the Supernatural forming the one system of God." The entire play of his mind in treatise, sermon, essay, was a vindication of this phrase ; — himself speaking to himself, revealing the secret of his own being and of all being. It was because he lived so profoundly in nature — finding it everywhere an analogon of the spirit — that he came to know the things of God, and God himself. It flows, a happy and mystic stream, through all his pages ; as when he writes of Niagara, which seemed to open his soul down to its inmost depths, and to show him his capacity "to think and feel greater things concerning God."

But nowhere is Bushnell's immersion in nature so clearly seen as in his "Moral Uses of Dark Things". In these fascinating pages he lays hold of nature in its obscurities, its diseases, its dangers, its mutabilities, and, as Keats says :

— "sorts
Out the dark mysteries of human souls
To clear conceiving :"

and so wrests them from the hands of pessimism and forces from them their secret, and lo ! they are a part of the one system of God and not discords, nor shadows cast from some "city of dreadful night."

It may seem to some that we speak of Bushnell as if Butler and Paley and Edwards had not lived, and that there were no preachers in New England who strengthened and adorned their sermons by illustrations drawn from nature. We have not forgotten these great teachers. The debt we owe to the Bridgewater School of divines is too great to be overlooked ; but it did not penetrate to the meaning of nature, nor did it make clear the relation of God to nature. He still dwelt in distant heavens while the works of his hand praised him here below. Creation had no unity save by a metaphysical inference. There was no vital relation between the facts and forms of nature and its truths. Bushnell, outrunning his day, conceived of God as immanent in his works — the soul and life of them. Their laws are His laws. Therefore, if one would know how God feels and thinks and acts, one must go to nature, and to humanity as its culmination. God is the spiritual reality of which nature is a manifestation. Bushnell not only saw this with absolute clearness, but he was entranced with it. It dominated him and forced his thought along its paths. Hence, when he came to speak of the Trinity his lips could utter no other word

but *manifestation*. His semi-Sabellianism — a heresy, if it be a heresy, to which he was foreordained — is the inevitable corollary to an immanent God. If God appears from within, — in things or in humanity, — it must be as a manifestation ; God becomes man. It does not matter that Bushnell assents in his own way to the Nicene Symbol, and is accorded a seat in that pantheon of ancient orthodoxy. If he lays down a conception of God as always “threeing” himself which justifies the use of persons, it is only as he finds supporting analogies in *human nature*, for wherever he goes that banner is still over him ; — and also because it presents God as “a being practically related to his creatures.” But the threeing makes no numerical revelation of his interior nature, but only his power of so manifesting himself. Yet, prior avowals — not antagonistic — still bind him. He does not forfeit his birthright of clear vision, nor give up the secret of nature which he — first of all about him — had seen, and subject himself to current interpretations of ancient formulas of belief ; they were well enough, but that was all. He was still a self-contained, independent thinker, who went his own way and marked his course by the visions of truth granted to him as he went along, — agreeing with others and with the past when he could, but under his own terms.

It was the same when he came to the “Vicarious Sacrifice.” He did not array texts (except to interpret them as altar-forms under his theory of language); nor did he quote the Fathers of the first three or the last three centuries, but carried his subject straight into “the facts and demonstrations occurring all the while in our human relations.” And here he stayed until the end. For the “governmental theory” he cared but little ; and with the “penal or expiatory theory” he would have nought to do. The “moral view” was his view to the last. Those who regard his “Forgiveness and Law” as a return to either of those theories must have forgotten its first pages, in which he says : “I recant no one of my denials. I still assert the moral view of the Atonement as before, and even more completely than before,” because he refers it to the “moral pronouncements of human nature and society.” And still more clearly does he affirm his lifelong thought : — “We cannot interpret God except by what we find in our own personal instincts and ideas.” Whether he advanced or strengthened the “moral view” of the Atonement by the second volume, may be questioned, but however that may be, any inter-

pretation of it as a recantation is to be regarded as a mistake in reading his own words. This second volume, taken as a whole, is simply a re-emphasis or extension of the patipassianism that runs through all his pages. It should be said, however, that he finds a kind of self-wrought propitiation of God, but it is natural and not forensic. If this takes him into the temple of ancient orthodoxy, he stands in the outer court and with eyes turned toward the broad fields of life and not to the altars of sacrifice. We would be explicit here. If, as Bushnell contends, God renders Himself more placable through the sufferings of His Son, it is not in the interest of righteousness—expiatory or governmental—but of infinite, all-mastering love ; but, he says, “it could by no possibility hold any one of the forms of legal atonement offered by the schools.” It has, however, made no headway as a phase of the Atonement. Thought is not moving in that direction, but rather away from it, and is grounding itself more and more on the “moral view,” which accords so well with the great duties and capacities of humanity.

In the same way, also, he treats the divinity of Jesus ; reversing the prevalent method, and approaching it from the purely human or natural side. He says : “There is no way to make out His divinity so effective and true as to put Him down into humanity, under the laws of humanity, and see, from his childhood onward, whether he stays there.” “The closer we bring him down to manhood, the more evidently, visibly, indisputably divine He appears.” These somewhat enigmatic sentences remind one of the fourth of Robertson’s six principles,—the substance of which he puts in a pregnant phrase : “Perfectly human, therefore divine.” The time had come when such a word must be spoken. Each came to it in his own way : Robertson through the Germans ; Bushnell along the path of his own insight. Unconsciously, he put himself in accord with the highest form of evolutionary philosophy ; as Browning states it in “Paracelsus” :

“All tended to mankind,
And, man produced, all has its end thus far ;
But in completed man begins anew
A tendency to God.”

The unity of nature thus fulfills itself : come from God in its remotest forms it finds its way back to man, and through perfect man to God from whom he came. Every stage is natural and also

supernatural, and thus forms one system. If Bushnell did not work this out completely to its inevitable conclusion, he was always hovering near it. Indeed, it must be said of him that he was a theologian of beginnings; he completed nothing. He attempted to finish by thought what could not yet be achieved; by light, but the full day had not dawned. Each of his great contentions is essentially true; but each requires what could not be given in his own nor in any previous day. "Christian Nurture" and the early chapters of the "Vicarious Sacrifice" come nearest being exceptions. But theology, today, calls for all latest knowledge to fill it out as a science; — psychology, ethnology, language, the physical sciences, civics, and above all, history not only as annals but as the inner life of the nations, — this knowledge Bushnell had but in part, but he wonderfully, if not fully, forestalled it by his own observing eye and penetrating mind, and by his passionate sense of the unity of God, and its corollary of God and nature as forming one system. Driven by his own nature into nature — among her laws and processes and intelligences — he finds himself in God. The great secret is revealed. Not in the heavens above nor in the depths below, but evermore within, — within our own minds and hearts; within the seed and within the center of the seed, evermore within is God to be found. Bushnell did not trace to the end the outworking of his own secret as it evolved itself in his thought and experience; nor will the mysteries lodged within the created universe and in the soul of man, which is a part of it, ever cease to unfold themselves. There is not another universe that drops its message or its laws down into this, as from some outward world. All that is, or can be for us, is this order in which we have our being, — nature and the supernatural, — one system of God who is in it in all the plenitude of his being; one system in which things are analogons of the spirit, and all are the Logos of God. Bushnell did not wholly attain; who has ever attained, or will? But he moved mightily in the right direction, — with great splendor of speech, with a genius that illumined every subject he touched, with a fervor and sincerity that raised a great mind into a great spiritual force which, today, a hundred years from his birth, still inspires the souls of men, and moves them to name him as a true interpreter of the divine secret of nature, having first made it his own.

REMINISCENCES OF THE BUSHNELL CONTROVERSY

BY AMOS S. CHESEBROUGH

Christian truth, in its essence, is ever one and the same. It is when men begin to practice their logic upon it, drawing inferences and spinning deductions, that there arise variations,—variations according to the standpoints of the reasoners, or, what is substantially the same, according to their respective mental characteristics and spiritual histories. Inferential theology is treacherous material to deal with. It is the mother of sects, and a provocative of controversy. St. Augustine, Martin Luther, John Wesley, and Jonathan Edwards blend beautifully in unity in their devout aspirations, their prayers and songs of praise and their deeds of charity, but when they draw out their beliefs into logical forms, and thus construct their respective systems of theology, they fall apart and quite probably into contention. The history of Christian doctrine—what is it but a perfect Babel of tongues, in large measure a record of speculations and contentions having no practical value for the Christian life?

Horace Bushnell, when first giving his thoughts to theological questions, fell into the prevailing habit of subjecting Christian doctrine to the test of logic; and it was only after a severe mental struggle, as he says, that he passed out of a state of incertitude and doubt into a clearer knowledge of God and his inspirations. The change was into faith. Christian doctrine was to him no longer a conclusion from a process of reasoning, but it was *formulated Christian experience*. It must be, not a speculation, not a piece of well-reasoned framework which nicely fits into a theological system, but something to *live by*,—something firstly, secondly, always vitally practical for the uses of the soul. It is in the same line of thought that Phillips Brooks, in his "Lectures on Preaching", says to candidates for the ministry, "Preach doctrine, not that men may believe it, but that men may be *saved* by believing it." In other words, doctrine was made for man, and not man for doctrine. There are few sermons in our English tongue so infused with the sweetness and light of the Gospel of Christ, and so replete with its

power, as those which Dr. Bushnell has left us. President Mark Hopkins, an attentive listener to a discourse which he preached at an installation service in North Adams, Mass., when asked, "Is not that the Gospel?" made the quick reply, "Nothing else is the Gospel." Here it is worthy of notice that the principle of testing the truth and value of doctrine by its practical relations to life is fundamental to Bushnell's entire system of religious thought. All God's creative and providential acts, even the dark things in nature, are to be interpreted and justified by the "moral uses" they subserve.

It has been assigned to me to give some personal REMINISCENCES OF DR. BUSHNELL,—*more especially of the "days of accusation" which ensued on the publication of his book "God in Christ."* These reminiscences will require the free use of the first person singular in the narrative, which I trust will not be regarded as an offense. In representing the facts in the case, as I know them to be, let it not be thought that there is any intention to impeach the motives of the good men who at the first and in no gentle terms condemned his views. It is presumed that they acted conscientiously in the matter, judging that the plaguespot of what they regarded as fundamental error demanded a severe surgery.

It was my unspeakable privilege to form the acquaintance of Dr. Bushnell in 1837, the fifth year of his pastorate over the North Church of Hartford, the church which in its present location is known as the Park Church,—an acquaintance which, as the years went by ripened into the freest intercourse and intimacy. It happened on this wise: During a season of religious awakening in the congregation of the Center Church, Hartford, I was engaged for a few weeks, as an assistant to the Pastor, Dr. Joel Hawes, in holding religious services among his young people and conducting prayer meetings. There was frequent preaching in the evening by invited ministers, one of whom was Dr. Bushnell. The announcement of the theme of his discourse startled me,—*"Duty not measured by our own Ability,"*—so directly contrary as it was to the contention of the New Haven Divinity School, with which Dr. Hawes was known to be in full accord. Dr. Hawes was a good deal disturbed by the sermon, fearing it might check the promising flow of religious feeling among his people. But whether conventionally orthodox or not, to me the word was with power. It made clear at a glance that the question of man's natural ability to good,

which had been the shuttlecock of controversy among New England theologians for more than a hundred years, presented a false issue. An introduction to the preacher followed the service; and my approach to him and his delightful home was cordially welcomed.

From the time of his settlement until the publication of the volume "God in Christ", in 1849, the printed products of his pen, with a single exception, provoked no serious dissent on the part of the keenly watchful guardians of orthodoxy. The marked exception was the treatise on "Christian Nurture", the first of his publications in book form,—a book now regarded as the standard work on the subject of child-training. This little treatise contained two discourses prepared for his own people. After a prolonged and critical examination by the publication committee of the Massachusetts Sunday School Society and their unanimous approval, it had scarcely appeared in print, in 1847, when its sale was suspended in consequence of the publication and wide circulation of an anonymous "Letter", indorsed by the Hartford North Association of Ministers, understood to have emanated from the East Windsor Theological Institute, and charging that the book was full of "dangerous tendencies." It is easy to understand that a charge of this nature would awaken suspicion, and that when the author of the book was appointed to preach the *Concio ad Clerum* on the "Divinity of Christ" the following year at New Haven, there would be a widespread interest to learn his views on so fundamental a doctrine. I did not fail to be present on the occasion, and though the closest attention was paid to the discourse I confess that I was more mystified than edified. Having been trained in a different psychology, his modes of thought and expression were a puzzle to me,—an experience which led me to exercise a large charity towards those who complained of his obscurity. When therefore the volume "God in Christ" came from the press, containing this discourse together with the discourses on the "Atonement" and the "Reviving of Religion", and also the "Dissertation on Language", I set myself to the exploring of its contents to discover, if possible, whether they had any intelligible meaning, and if so, what it was. There was found no great difficulty in the case, for after getting the author's standpoint and his bearings the whole horizon of his doctrine swung round into position and its meaning and consistency were made clear.

The inquiry that next presented itself was, On what grounds were the reviewers and critics filling the land with accusations of radical and dangerous heresy? It seemed as if the systematic onset upon the book was the result of a concerted plan to crush out the errors in it by one strong combined effort, and that for this end each theological center was to furnish a champion. The first of these criticisms came from the Divinity School at New Haven. Under the caption "What does Dr. Bushnell mean?" three articles signed "Omicron", appeared in *The New York Evangelist*, which were gathered into a pamphlet of twenty-eight pages and extensively distributed. In the course of a week or two Princeton Seminary gave its weighty verdict in an article of forty pages in *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*. The next assault was made by *The Christian Observatory*, a religious monthly edited by seven leading Congregational ministers of Boston, in an article of sixty pages, bitter in the extreme. About the same time there emanated from Bangor Theological Seminary a volume of one hundred and eighteen pages, entitled, "A Review of Dr. Bushnell's God in Christ." The Theological Seminary at East Windsor furnished no formal review, but kept up a running fire on the book in the columns of *The Religious Herald*, a Hartford weekly. There were other reviews and critical notices, but these were the leading ones, and enough of them to have demolished a full score of heretics. Few persons outside of Dr. Bushnell's own congregation ventured to speak approvingly or even in tolerance of his views, though many charitably suspended their judgment as to his orthodoxy, hoping that the case was not as bad as represented. But prominent theologians condemned the book as heterodox, and expressed the apprehension that it was the entering wedge to the cleaving asunder of our churches, like that which had befallen the Massachusetts Congregationalists in the Unitarian defection. The stress was tremendous. It is impossible for those who have come upon the stage of public life within the last thirty years to realize the intense excitement and tremulous apprehension caused by these charges of heresy against so prominent a character. The pulpits of Hartford and the neighborhood were barred against him as they would have been against an avowed Unitarian or Universalist; and the ministers, who were suspending their judgments with regard to his soundness in the faith, refrained from exchanging pulpits with him, lest they should compromise themselves before their own peo-

ple or before their ministerial brethren. The expression of any sympathy with him brought a man at once under suspicion.

An examination of the several criticisms of the book led me at once to the clear conviction that the charge of heresy rested upon no substantial basis. Although he rejected certain inferential theories of the Trinity and of the Atonement, and expounded these doctrines, not under logical formulas, but under the laws of expression, and thus differently from those who were regarded as standard theologians, it was clearly manifest that he accepted them in their essential verity as doctrines of the New Testament. He accepted them at their face, as of unutterable value as practical doctrines for the uses of the soul. And then it was clearly apparent, 1st, that the theories of these doctrines as held by the several critics were in an inextricable tangle—that there was no agreement between the different schools; and 2d, that in their interpretation of Bushnell, even of the self-same passages of his book, they flatly contradicted one another.

Providentially it fell to me at that time, by appointment, to prepare a paper to be read before the Middlesex Association of Ministers, of which I was a member, and in that paper the results of my investigation were given. The paper was listened to in grim silence, broken only by one of my brethren with the ominous menace: "Take care, Brother Chesebrough, or we will have you tried for heresy."

Very likely I was inconsiderate, but I could not hold my peace when I saw a ministerial brother inquisitorially condemned and threatened with martyrdom for errors with which he was not justly chargeable, and so I offered to prepare for the *Religious Herald* a series of brief articles on Bushnell's book, on condition that the editor, Mr. Moseley, who was an old acquaintance, would not disclose the name of the writer. The design was not to attempt any formal defense of Bushnell, but rather to show that the charges of fundamental heresy made against him were self-contradictory and groundless, and that he stood as truly within the limits of accepted orthodoxy as did his assailants. The offer was accepted, and the articles began to appear over the signature CC., No. 1 with the caption: "Do they understand him?" No. 2: "What is orthodoxy?" and so on. It had been claimed by a previous contributor to the *Herald* that all the critics "had concurred entirely in their understanding of Dr. Bushnell." But in

these articles quotations from different critics, by being placed side by side in parallel columns and otherwise contrasted, showed violent contradictions among them, assigning directly opposite opinions to him on the same subject, and also indicating conflicting doctrinal beliefs among the critics themselves. There are few heresies on the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, named in ecclesiastical history, of which he was not accused by one or more of them, and of heresies that excluded each other. He was made responsible for all possible inferences from his language, and called by hard names fished up out of ancient theologic rubbish — a Socinian, a Sabellian, an Apollinarian, a Docetist — as if calling a man opprobrious names answered for evidence of heresy. But so at odds were the critics shown to be with one another, that it was seen to be impracticable to formulate a charge of heresy against *him* which would not have involved the orthodoxy of one or more of the critics themselves. The views of New Haven, East Windsor, Boston, and Bangor could not by any ingenuity be reconciled with one another, and Princeton was at sword's points with them all, and actually found less to dissent from in Bushnell than either of them. Boston accuses him of being pantheistic in his notions ; Princeton says : "There is nothing to *intimate* that he is a pantheist." New Haven charges him with holding that in the incarnation God united himself to a human body devoid of soul. Bangor says, no ; Christ is represented as simply a man in whom dwelt a divine power. On Bushnell's denying the distinct subsistence of a human soul in Christ, East Windsor, shocked at such an idea, breaks forth with the question : "What sort of a human soul must that be which has no distinct subsistence?" Such an assertion is declared to be a "manifest absurdity." While Princeton agrees with Bushnell and asks : "Who ever heard of two distinct subsistences in Christ?" But enough ! These specimens need not be multiplied. What a pitiful commentary this on the inferential theology of the day, each theologian claiming that his doxy is the only Simon-pure orthodoxy ! How unsatisfactory and divisive the methods of these professedly technical scholars in constructing their creeds ! The situation was pathetic, and yet there was a touch of humor in it. The combined purpose was to batter down Bushnell's defenses ; but by hasty and unintelligent action and bad marksmanship they wasted their ammunition in bombarding one another's strongholds to their own

discomfiture ; while he sat safe and serene within his own lines, suffering it may be some slight discomfort from the outside noise made by his assailants, but nothing more.

This simple exposition of affairs brought on a sudden turn of the tide. The publisher of the *Herald* was repeatedly and even peremptorily questioned by some of the Hartford pastors as to who this CC. was. On his refusal to answer, he was threatened with the loss of the patronage of the *Herald* unless these articles were stopped. On this Mr. Moseley wrote me, begging that out of regard to the opposition of some of his influential patrons I would bring my articles to a close. I acceded to his request on his printing No. 8 of the series, which was now in his hands, entitled "Is the Atonement vicarious ?"

In the course of a week or two, happening at New Haven during Commencement week to meet Dr. Bushnell, who had been ignorant of the authorship of these papers, I invited him to an interview. In a walk on a quiet road leading northward out of the city I disclosed to him the story of the articles and the reasons for their discontinuance. How he was affected by the disclosure need not be told. Not long afterwards I was surprised by a letter from Hartford signed by the names of the following gentlemen : Thomas Day, Amos M. Collins, Normand Smith, Thomas C. Perkins, Lucius H. Woodruff, Austin Dunham, Luzerne Rae, and James Dixon, of which this is a copy, viz.:

"To CC. of the *Religious Herald*, —

"DEAR SIR: It has been a subject of regret to many that your candid and convincing articles in the *Herald* could not be continued in that paper. These articles were exerting a very important influence, and the public were beginning to see in them that there was as little agreement among the reviewers of Dr. Bushnell themselves and among our orthodox theologians as between them all and our pastor, and that therefore a re-investigation of the subject was really demanded. Desiring to give your articles a more extended circulation, and also to give you an opportunity to say all that you designed to say, we, the undersigned, request you to furnish us for publication a copy of these articles, and of any others necessary to complete your view of the subject."

In response to this request the series of articles was completed, and they were printed in a pamphlet with the title, "Contributions of CC. now declared in full as Criticus Criticorum."

While these articles were running through the press, Dr. Bushnell's book, "God in Christ," came up for consideration

before the Hartford Central Association, of which he was a member, as a court of inquiry, and a committee was appointed to investigate the charges of fundamental errors in it. The storm of accusation had however already passed the point of extreme violence; confidence began to be restored, and good people generally, seeing that they had been suffering a needless fright, began to breathe a little more freely. And when four months later, in October of that year, 1849, the committee of the Association, of which the venerable Dr. Noah Porter was chairman, reported, "that whatever errors the book may contain, it furnishes no sufficient ground for instituting a judicial process with him"—that is to say, they were not fundamental errors—the report was accepted with only three dissenting votes. This acquittal, according to Congregational polity, should have ended all ecclesiastical action. The purpose of the prosecution was, when carried to its result, to institute a trial of Dr. Bushnell for heresy before the Consociation and depose him from the ministry, or at least to declare him to be out of Congregational fellowship; but this purpose was foiled by the action of his Association. The Fairfield West Association of Ministers, however, were not satisfied with this settlement of the case. With a conscientious zeal and persistency worthy of a better cause, they continued their efforts for nearly five years without success to obtain by disorderly methods some judicial condemnation of Bushnell and his book, to the great annoyance of our ecclesiastical bodies and the disturbance of the peace of the churches. A detailed account of these efforts has been given in a valuable historical monograph by Rev. Dr. Edwin P. Parker, entitled "The Hartford Central Association and the Bushnell Controversy," to which I can only make reference without any attempt at quotation. Let it suffice to say that, like storms in the natural world, this storm though long and tedious could not last forever. It gradually died down to a calm from sheer self-exhaustion, and when it was over men were left to wonder how the elements could have been so violently agitated. It seemed to have been more like a troubled dream than a reality. Confidence by degrees took the place of suspicion and alienation, and as one has said: "God spared Dr. Bushnell's life until all men were at peace with him."

And what has been the result of this whole deplorable controversy? Has it not been to teach ministers and churches so effectively the much-needed lessons of Christian comprehensiveness and

Christian charity that the like shall never occur again? And with regard to the writings which were the occasion of the controversy, what is coming to be the public verdict? As a way-mark pointing to the true answer to this question, I quote from an article in the *New Englander*, by Dr. Leonard Bacon, written soon after Bushnell's death, in which he says:—

“My reëxamination of those two volumes, ‘God in Christ’ and ‘Christ in Theology’, not often consulted since I first read them more than a quarter of a century ago, and my recollection of the theological and ecclesiastical disturbances of which they were the occasion, have given me a new perception of their value as a contribution, not to theology only but also to the advancement of religion. His influence embodied in these volumes has contributed much to make our New England theology—let me rather say, all the evangelical theology of our English tongue—less rigidly scholastic, more scriptural, broader in its views, more inspiring in its relations to the pulpit and to the Christian life.”

It now remains upon the subject assigned me to give a brief answer to the question: What spirit and temper did Dr. Bushnell manifest in these days of accusation? How did he behave? I reply unqualifiedly: Like a true servant of his Master, the Lord Jesus Christ. Both in brawn and in brain he possessed the capacities of a mighty man of valor, which would have made him a formidable antagonist in any encounter. In repelling the attacks upon his discourses on “Christian Nurture” he dealt some stinging blows against his assailants. But this ebullition of wounded feeling he afterwards regretted, and on the publication of “God in Christ” he bound himself not to reply to any assaults made upon him. I quote from a record which I made more than twenty years ago describing what I knew to have been the spirit of the man:

“The book was written under a sense of supreme loyalty to the truth, and sent forth on its public mission in obedience to considerations of duty, which in the view of the author were only another name for the voice of God. So far as God was in it God would take care of it. In this state of mind there was to be no controversy with men, for to go down into the arena of theological conflict, was it not to contradict the design with which the work was undertaken?”

And on this anniversary occasion I am able to say, God *was* in it and *has* taken care of it.

I can add to this record the testimony that I do not remember to have heard him utter *an unkind word* respecting those who an-

tagonized him. When the question of his having published fundamental and dangerous errors was under consideration before his Association, he made answer to the charge in a carefully prepared paper which was afterwards enlarged into the volume, "Christ in Theology." But it was not, as he says, a handling of his adversaries to any such extent as involves controversy. It was simply an ecclesiastical defense, or more properly a dissertation. He was a party to no controversy. The controversy was all outside of him.

In a letter to Rev. Henry Goodwin—a dear friend who had grown up under his ministry—he thus unbosoms himself when men rose up against him :

"I seem to be now very much cut off from access to the public, not so, I trust, from access to God. God is left, and he is the best public to me, the only public in which I have any satisfaction, and I think with the highest delight of going apart with him into a desert place to rest awhile. No, not to rest, but only to get away from noise, and to live in the silence of love and duty. I long inexpressibly for the rest of my life to be wholly immersed in the better element, and it is my daily prayer that God would give me this best and most to be desired of all gifts—the gift of a private benefit, to be seen in the usefulness of my ministry to my own flock. These know me and love me, and I pray that God will enable me to lead them into green pastures."

What strength and courage and patience must it have brought to him, under a sense of having been misunderstood and wronged, that he could say: "These, my flock, know me and love me"! Whatever the doctors of theology might say, these knew him through his life and ministry to be a man of God, an incarnation of the Gospel of Christ. There is something sublime in the loving loyalty of his people, as they stood around him with linked hands in unbroken ranks for testimony and for defense.

In bringing these reminiscences to a close I must not neglect to add, that it was his privilege to possess a most restful retreat in the sanctuary of his own delightful home, where he could recruit his strength for labor and find support in trial. As in God's good providence the home of his childhood, where the foundations of his character were laid, was presided over by a maternal wisdom and piety of no common cast, so it came about that his manhood was blest with a home-companionship of a high order of intellectual and spiritual culture, under the influence of which asperities were softened, ideals perfected, and spirituality deepened. Here

his great heart lavished its wealth of love and received full measure of the same in return. Here he was ever met with an intelligent as well as an affectionate sympathy, and as he says, with "instigations always to good and never to evil mistaken for good." It is not rash to assume, that had these domestic relations been other than they were, Horace Bushnell would have been other than he was. The halo of his noble character and honorable fame might not have shined with the same bright luster. But in the home that God gave him, his great endowments unfolded themselves in a genial atmosphere that insured their symmetrical development and their highest and most lasting efficiency.

BUSHNELL THE CITIZEN

BY CHARLES HOPKINS CLARK

We all know how royalty travels abroad. A pilot engine runs over the course a little in advance, and then comes the train which bears the persons of importance. I appear here tonight in the capacity of pilot engine, signifying to this audience that when I am safely out of the way this place shall be taken by Dr. Parker and Mr. Twichell, whom we have all come to hear.

I thank you sincerely for the opportunity to take part, however inadequately, in these exercises, and in speaking of Dr. Bushnell as a citizen I must inevitably speak of him also as a long-time companion and dear friend. I remember him as far back as I remember anybody. His figure is as distinct against the shadowy background of my early days as are those of my parents, for I was born and brought up right across the street from his home.

He must have been about fifty years old at the time I first recall him. Though the obvious mistake corrects itself later, it is true that the child in its ignorance considers fifty years to be old age, and so the Doctor (and "Doctor" he had been then for a dozen years) began in my mind as an old man. But he never seemed to grow any older until he reached those last few years of courageous feebleness when we all saw, and none more clearly than himself, that he was near the end. His health really began to break when he was about forty-five, but the splendid strength of his constitution and his own indomitable will kept him active and apparently vigorous a quarter of a century after a different nature would have succumbed. As I still clearly remember him, he had an elastic, springy walk, and, as he moved along the street, swung freely and frequently a cane that he always carried. Toward the end of his life the cane was on the ground, not in the air, and the spring was out of his step, but still the sense of a commanding presence and the suggestion of a mighty man were always there as long as he was visible among us.

My own obligation to him begins very early, for when I was nearer three feet high than six, and could drown a good deal

easier than I can now, he pulled me out of the water and saved my life. I saw him every day, as neighborhood children see their neighbors, always getting from him the friendly greeting and the personal recognition that are so welcome to a child when they come from older people, who, for their part, are too apt to pass children by unnoticed. Sundays I went regularly, because I was taken, to the Old North Church, where I counted the tassels on the pulpit cushion, thirty-nine of them there were—the thirty-nine articles of the church so far as I knew any—studied the forms and the faces of the deacons, who presented some very interesting contrasts in American citizenship, wondered at the attire of certain old-school gentlemen among them who persisted in wearing swallow-tail coats, furtively calculated the different angles at which the several mouths in the choir gave forth their sweetest notes, and went home, as no doubt children do today, with impressions of various things that were not all in the sermon.

From the time that I was about fifteen until after my graduation from Yale, Dr. Bushnell and I spent each summer together at Deacon Hopkins' on the north side of Lake Waramaug in Warren, only a short distance from New Preston, the village at the foot of the lake where Dr. Bushnell had grown up from boyhood to manhood. We were on the water fishing every day when the weather permitted. Dr. Bushnell loved to fish. The best man the world ever saw chose fishermen for his disciples, and chose fish to feed the multitude and to work his miracle with. The practice and cultivation of patience, which is a parent of character, and the exercise and indulgence of hope, which is the partner of the imagination, are necessary incidents of the fisherman's occupation. Not every good man loves to fish, but every true fisherman has in him choice qualities which include a brotherly feeling for others of the same taste. Dr. Bushnell and I had a boat. I would do the rowing and he would hold the line as we trolled. Those who are familiar with this form of sport need not be informed that, while a philosopher can prove that it takes both persons to catch the fish under such circumstances, still the pleasure of the occasion goes to one and the exercise to the other. I got the exercise, but I had the company too. And when the boat was at anchor each had the same chance.

It is a matter of unceasing regret to me that, having had the delightful privilege of intimate association with two such men as

Dr. Bushnell and Mr. Warner, with the latter of whom I worked side by side for thirty years, I have failed to keep any diary or take notes of the entertaining and instructive talk which has come from their lips.

The Doctor as a fisherman used to throw back all the little fish that came his way, with kindly admonitions as to their youthful folly, and he always had one heavy line out, away off the stern, baited for the biggest fish in the lake. That was what he was after. I can picture him now as he sat in the boat discoursing of large things, a great man dealing with some great theme, when suddenly he would jump as if he had an electric shock and cry, "My kingdom!" and enter into the joy of catching a fish with as much relish as the boy beside him could. If perchance it proved to his disgust that he had caught an eel or a bullhead, the sincerity of his emotion was not disguised. We fished every day for three or four months each year.

But the Doctor was not merely a fisherman. He was fond of all phases of nature. He took great pleasure in horses and in driving, and he always drove over from Hartford to Warren, about forty-five miles. My recollection is that quite often he would sell his horse in the fall and buy a new one in the spring. I know that first and last he had a good many. He named them in his original way. One big, raw-boned fellow, with high hips and very sharp, sloping withers, he named "Gothic", in recognition of his architectural suggestiveness. Gothic had a very powerful and progressive gait, and I recollect that returning one hot and dusty Sunday from Warren church, when each vehicle made a cloud for itself as it moved along the highway, the Doctor let Gothic out and passed everybody on the road. The horse was in the spirit of the occasion and so was the Doctor, and we banged recklessly along the rough roadside over stones and ditches, half the time in mid air — he intent on getting there and his passenger somewhat more solicitous that we survive the experience — until every other team was well behind us. Then the Doctor turned to me with a delightful twinkle in his eye. All he said was: "My boy, I don't like dust." But, though he liked to go fast, he had abundant philosophy on the horse question, and I have heard him give the sound advice that in buying a horse for use in our hilly country the most important gait to consider was the walk, because a horse walked most of the time.

The Doctor was a great walker, too, taking in all there was to see and much that many couldn't see. He knew all the flowers and trees, and wherever he wandered he had a way of cutting odd sticks for canes. Of course he was altogether familiar with the detail of country life, and went in and out among the live stock as any farmer would. It is related that once in exploring Pinnacle Mountain, on the east shore of Lake Waramaug, a revered president of Yale and one of his associates, crossing an open lot, found themselves actively followed by a herd of cattle. The creatures away back on the hill never saw a man except when salt was brought to them, of which they were very fond, and they joyfully assumed that the Yale faculty was there to supply their want, and so they rushed capering to the feast. The learned gentlemen, unaware of the conditions, imagined their lives in danger and fled at top speed, casting aside hats and coats, and making a record for themselves which soon became a part of the history of the place, and is still told with much satisfaction by the old residents. I have seen Dr. Bushnell under similar circumstances as much at his ease among such animals as he would have been if they were rabbits. He always knew where he was and what to do.

He was a keen observer both of men and things. His wit was delightful and abundant. His conversation was full of characteristic phrases, and his comments on passing events, while sure to be entertaining, bore always the flavor of his thoughtful temperament. His letters incidentally mention experiences at the various national capitals. He did not enjoy the atmosphere of Washington. "This is a most contemptible and wretched place", he wrote in 1844. In London, after the usual struggle, he secured a place in the gallery of the House of Commons and the debate began. In disgust he writes: "It was one flat after another. A neighbor asked as I arose to go: 'Do you expect to return, sir?' 'No, never', was my answer."

In Paris he could not understand the arguments in the French Assembly, which were in the unintelligible language that prevails there, but he drew this philosophic inference after watching awhile: "One theory I count certain on physiological principles: that so much of short, rapid gesture from the elbow cannot be connected with great depth of sentiment or the highest dignity of matter."

He loved dearly his native State, and his heart beat with patri-

otic pride in her. One of his finest addresses is his famous "Historical Estimate of Connecticut", and no one else has ever condensed her whole political history from the time of Hooker to today into one pregnant phrase as he did when he described her as "independent as not knowing how to be otherwise."

Whenever he was out of doors his active mind was playing the part of surveyor; planning how railroads could run through this cut or around that hill, and where houses should stand to get the best view of choice landscapes which he had come upon. When he was in California he devoted weeks to finding the best site for the proposed university, and it was located at Berkeley in accordance with his suggestion; and it is related that at that time he determined to his own satisfaction how the Pacific Railroad could best reach the coast, selecting a route which was finally chosen by the surveyors. He never stopped thinking. I found among some papers at home the other day his patent for a furnace. Whether it came to any general use I do not know, but he warmed his own house with one for years. Then there was a 3-cylinder Bushnell stove. And it is an old story but an established fact that he first developed the idea of propelling a boat by pumping water in at the bow and out of the stern, which proved a practical method of locomotion. No doubt there were plenty of other inventions, but I do not recall them. He was very fond of work, in which I mean to include manual labor. In his garden in early life he often worked barefooted in the small hours of the morning before other people were about.

Mr. Hiram Bissell, one of Hartford's old residents, told me recently of his first meeting with the Doctor. Mr. Bissell was then a mason's apprentice, and was sent with a lot of mortar to the Bushnell house, which was at that time in Ann street. He found a man there in overalls laying brick, who drew him so into conversation that he was two hours on his errand. Being asked among other things if he went to church, the boy replied that he did because he had to. He added that the only preacher he cared to hear was Bushnell, "who", he said, "does not strike me as very brilliant, but somehow he sets me thinking." When he found soon after in the talk that he was addressing the man himself, whom he had not recognized in the bricklayer, he was inclined to be much disturbed, but the Doctor smoothed it all out in an agreeable and tactful way and put him entirely at his ease. Dr. Bush-

nell advised him to make Hartford his home, and told him it was bound to be a large and influential city (it had then about 10,000 people), and he went on to outline the plans he entertained for a water system and a park, the latter of which has been of such inestimable value to the place. That was fifteen or twenty years before the work was actually undertaken. As for the water supply, Dr. Bushnell was a great believer in the Connecticut River. In January, 1847, he preached his sermon on "Prosperity Our Duty", in advocacy of an elaborate project which a few days before had been formally presented to the city. It was to bring the river down by canal from Windsor Locks, securing three hundred thousand horse-power, and opening great manufacturing possibilities here, beside furnishing water for municipal uses. The estimated cost was about \$750,000, and that was a good deal larger than the courage of the community at that time, though probably today Hartford people have more than that amount invested in the somewhat similar and phenomenally successful project subsequently developed at Holyoke. The appropriate text which he selected for the discourse was: "This same Hezekiah stopped the upper water course of Gihon and brought it straight down to the west side of the city of David." Half a dozen years later the city established pumping works at the river, and still later, abandoning these, found its water supply on the mountain range to the west. Dr. Bushnell at first opposed this last change. Mr. Bissell, already alluded to, was urgent for it, and at his request Dr. Bushnell made a study of the situation. In his usual thorough way he rode day by day on horseback along the ridge of hills, studying the conditions, and finally, becoming convinced of the feasibility of the plan, he took up the cause with his usual vigor, and with that powerful assistance Mr. Bissell's plan succeeded. When Dr. Bushnell's plan for a park was brought before the city he gave a detailed estimate of the cost, and in his speech, replying to the suggestion that his might not be trustworthy figures, he explained that he had built two houses, drawn the plans himself, and made them come out less than the estimate. And, I may add, the park, too, came within his figures.

I have said he preached on "Prosperity Our Duty", referring to the proposed utilization of the river. That was only one of several sermons on the practical topics of the day—what might be called sermons of citizenship. Another and a famous one was his Fast

Day sermon in 1844 on the political situation. We get a keen suggestion of the Doctor's independence in the preface to the printed edition of this discourse, where he remarks that he prints it not because it is supposed to have any merit, but because it has been denounced. In this sermon he lays down the proposition that he "cannot let politics alone until shown that politics are not under the government of God, beyond the sphere of moral obligation." This is the address which is said to have been influential in defeating Henry Clay, who, it will be remembered, carried Connecticut, where the sermon was preached, by about 3,000 votes, but lost New York and so the presidency by only 5,000 votes through the sudden up-coming of Birney's Free Soil vote in that State, where the sermon had been widely circulated and was said to have had a wide influence. Dr. Bushnell referred to Clay as "the man who was foremost in extending slavery, who took upon his soul the sorrows of untold millions of bondsmen, and the moral desolation of the fairest portion of the globe." In a footnote we get another suggestion of the Doctor's courage when he points out that this was not assailing Clay as a candidate, "for if my purpose had been to injure Mr. Clay as a candidate, I should not have assailed the least vulnerable point of his character." That certainly was not much of an apology or of a compliment.

There were also numerous sermons directly upon slavery, which illustrate the growth of his sentiment on that subject, but I will not attempt to outline those here. I mention them to indicate that he was the citizen, living up to his civic duty as he understood it, whether in the pulpit or out of it. His occasional addresses, too familiar to be recited here, are full of his exalted notion of high morality and conscientious citizenship. What a lesson in both combined he gives us in his apostrophe to truth from the Phi Beta Kappa oration on the "True Weal of Nations":

"Be not afraid of principle. He who has a principle is inspired. Doubtless there is some difficulty in swaying the opinions and prejudices of our people, but the worst impediment truth has ever had to complain of in our country has been in its spiritless and distrustful advocates. There needs to be a certain exaltation of courage and inspired pertinacity in the advocates of truth. She must not be distrusted or cloaked in disguises and accommodations. She must go before in full, unsoiled whiteness, and the majesty and spirit of her gait must invigorate her followers.

"Truth is the daughter of God. He possessed her in the beginning of His way. Silence is her voice. The charmed orbs hear it forever, and fol-

lowing and revolving do but transcribe her word. The masses and central depths also know her presence, and the gems sparkle before her in their secret places. The buried seeds and roots inwardly know her, and, penciling their flowers and preparing their several fragrances, send them up to bloom and exhale around her. She penetrates all things. Not laws, not bars nor walls, can exclude her goings. Even prejudice and the madness of the people, which cannot look upon her face, do yet behold her burnished feet with secret amazement. Understanding, then, that truth is almighty, let us become her interpreters and prophets. Have faith in truth. Install her in the affections of your youth, consecrating to her all your talents and the full vigor of your lives, and be assured that she will in no wise permit you to fail. She will fill you with peace and lead you to honor."

Thoroughly practical, as in his addresses on roads and city plans, and so many others, he nevertheless inevitably showed his religious nature in the turn of his thought in whatever he wrote. Yet this always came spontaneously out of the very quality of the man, and was never lugged in or tied on like the moral of a tale.

Horace Bushnell, the citizen, was the great man whose interests were as large as those of all mankind. His intelligence made him more or less a critic, but his faith kept him ever an optimist. The material and the spiritual welfare of the world were alike the constant concern of his restless and progressive nature. One cannot read his published papers without realizing the splendid largeness of his views of life, nor study his career without a sense of the great work that he did and the lofty ideals of citizenship that he entertained and fulfilled. He reached his eminence as a minister of the gospel, but, had he remained in the newspaper work which he began in New York in 1828, he would have stood unquestionably first not only in time but in prestige among the remarkable editors of his period; and had he continued in the law there is no doubt that his wonderful intellectual powers would have made him a leader in that profession.

As a resident of Hartford, I prefer to consider not only Dr. Bushnell the citizen, but especially Dr. Bushnell our fellow citizen in this community. He has left his stamp upon the thought of his day, and so on the life of the days that have come after and are yet to come, and his influence has spread and is still spreading in the untraceable but irresistible way in which ideas move. But in Hartford the mark of his powerful hand and of his guiding mind

is directly distinguishable in every progressive step that was taken here during his citizenship among us; and that was the formative period of the Hartford of today. He took part in the advance of all our various municipal improvements. As has been pointed out, he urged other projects without success, that, in the contemplative hindsight of today, we can see now, as he saw then, would have been of the largest public advantage; and we owe directly to him the city's chief ornament, and one of its chief utilities, Bushnell Park, and also the location of the State Capitol on the hill overlooking the park. No audience assembled in Hartford needs be told what this park is today. But let me read you Dr. Bushnell's description of what it was. He wrote to Donald G. Mitchell as follows:

"I very much regret that some photographic picture of the condition had not been taken; but even that could have given but a faint representation of deformities the future ages will never know or conceive. The New Haven railroad spanned the territory lengthwise from end to end, — having a deep cut under the College Hill and a high embankment through the low ground on the east, where it came to a full period in a huge, unsightly structure of wood standing astride of the river and serving as bridge, car-house, freight-house, and passenger office. Two lines of high grading, one from the west end and the other from the east, converged as curves at a wooden covered bridge in front of the present station on Asylum street and made up a triangle for backing off to Springfield and New Haven. In the center of the lot were the engine-house, the wood-work and iron-work repair shops; and back of the latter on the east was a deep gulf or hole, diked in by the embankment, into which the ashes and cinders were rolling, — overhung, also, on the embankment side by a rough wood-shed, standing partly on legs, and having a high water-tank and pumping works on its eastern end, which said hole is now a pretty basin or tarn, bordered neatly with turf, for the great fountain. The waste and broken trumpery of the road were everywhere. And, besides the great hole above named, there were two others inside the embankment triangle, and still another dug out in the western slope of the hill-ground, to obtain gravel for the dam of a huge old grist-mill standing on that border. Around the mill were grouped eight or ten low tenements, with as many pigsties, that appear to have dropped there by accident.

"Farther round, at the extreme north bend of the river, and directly off Asylum street, in front of the new Park Church, all the garbage and truck of the city were dumped, as in a Gehenna without, — fire-shavings, underbed fillings, tin waste, leather cuttings, cabbage stumps, hats without tops, old saddles, stove-pipes rusted out, everything, in short, that had no right to be anywhere else. There were besides on the premises two old tanneries, one falling to pieces, the other barely managing to stand

upon a slant; and on a high clay bank, just in front of the present Park Row block, was a little African Methodist Chapel, looking out for prospect on the general litter of the region. And, finally, there was a back-side frontage of filthy tenements, including a soap works that ran completely round upon the east and northeast bank of the river and projected their outhouses over it on brackets and piers—saying, as it were, to the coming ornament, ‘We give you such help as we can.’”

The development of the plan was, of course, the development of opposition to it. Ours is a New England community, and what community is there in free and independent New England where the other side has not its advocates—advocates, when no other reason offers, just because it is the other side. Two old mills upon the area which it was proposed to improve were burned while the question was in agitation, and Dr. Bushnell was accused of having burned them. But in spite of opposition the vote carried in favor of the park, and the work was undertaken and executed whose results are the pride of the city. The report on the subject made by a special committee of the city government was inspired, if not written, by Dr. Bushnell, and, with the prevision of the seer, it draws, amid the desolation of 1854, a true picture of the beauty that blooms for us today.

So far as I can learn, Dr. Bushnell’s agitation for a park for Hartford was one of the earliest movements, if not the earliest, of the sort in New England, and Hartford has led among New England cities in that matter. Curiously enough, after all he did to get it for us, recognized by us all as it was in the phrase “Dr. Bushnell’s Park”, it was not named for him but was merely “The Park” until the city government formally gave his name to it a day or two before his death. His grateful appreciation when informed of this act was one of his last signs of consciousness. What he saw in the park beyond and above its physical beauty he can best say for himself. Appealing in 1872 for a location of the statehouse elsewhere than on the park itself, which had been decided upon, he actually, in a public meeting, reversed public opinion and started the movement that led to buying out Trinity College and placing the building on the old college grounds. In his speech he said:

“My friends, I have done something for this city because I love Hartford, and have tried to give some evidence of it in what I did to secure this park. And how I have got my pay I will tell you. I have been on

the park and seen there the humble people, — now an old man, feeble and tottering, going to rest himself, and then have looked upon a sickly woman and her child, who had no bright spot at home, who had come out here to breathe and see one of God's smiles, and they did see it. I have got my pay in that way. They none of them knew me; therefore the more I enjoyed their joy. They didn't know that I had anything to do with getting the park, and it was best that they did not as I walked along. And these children of the poor going there have seen the children of the higher families of the city, and there has been an associated feeling excited. The rich have seen the condition of the poor, and good has come out of this association."

In Hartford our especial gratitude goes out to him for this park. It gives us reason for continual thanksgiving over his wise public spirit, and keeps alive our pride not only in the park itself, but in the rich imagination that could see this garden where others saw only hopeless squalor and irremediable confusion and decay.

It is told that when asked where he would like his monument put he pointed out one of the arches of the stone bridge and said, "Under there." It was Cato, I believe, who said he'd rather it were asked why he hadn't a statue than why he had. So Dr. Bushnell wanted none. Many expressions of regret are heard that there is no statue of him, and yet Bushnell Park, lovely, and, as he put it, wearing God's smiles, is after all his fitting memorial, giving direct physical benefits every day to the people, and at the same time teaching them always the higher things through its revelation of the wonder and the beauty of God's handiwork. No statue could present Dr. Bushnell as he was. With the life out of it, his effigy would utterly fail to bring him back to us except by the tantalizing method of unsatisfactory suggestion, showing us not what he was but what he was not. He was a man by himself. Like all really great men, he possessed that delightful quality of unaffected, almost childlike simplicity. His greatness was never a barrier. He moved in and out among his fellow citizens here in Hartford, a giant, who, however, felt no greater than the smaller folk about him. It was his way for many years as he went to and fro between his home and the post-office to step in at the stores, banks, editorial rooms, and business offices, settle himself down in a chair, and discuss with his friends there in most familiar fashion the topics of the day. His sentiment towards all his fellow men was one of universal good will.

In appearance he was different from everybody else. As I

remember his dress, it was altogether plain and rather of the homespun order. I recall, especially in his later days, a winter outfit of a rough gray overcoat and a cap that he pulled down over his ears. But it is his face that stays in my memory, and will always seem to me the most beautiful I ever saw on a man. His deep-set eyes looked out from their thoughtful home in a way that suggested his vast intellectual strength, and at the same time there was a radiant softness and gentleness of expression that robbed the strength of its severity. And when those eyes mellowed with the light of affectionate welcome, it was like a benediction.

Those who enjoyed a personal intimacy with him recall, almost with surprise, the terms of ease and apparent equality on which they associated with him, and, looking backward, feel sometimes as if they had walked irreverent in holy places. But while they were with him they were conscious chiefly of the sweet sunshine of his great soul and the human sympathy that brought him in so many ways so close to them. Those who knew him rather by his works have perhaps a larger sense of the man's importance in human affairs. Distance often makes proportion clearer. But to all people, be they personal friends and acquaintances or only those who know him by the thoughts and the works that survive him, — to all these alike he stands out a great man. We bare our heads in veneration before him and humble ourselves at the humility of the man who wrote of himself in that brief and touching fragment of autobiography: "Take the report of my doings on the platform of the world's business, and it is naught. I have filled no place at all." Filled no place at all! What a revelation of himself to himself, when, at his release here, he saw truly the place that he had filled! And what place must he be filling now at the source of truth and the fountainhead of knowledge and of love.

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES

BY JOSEPH H. TWICHELL

It is assigned to me for my part in the present commemoration, to speak of Dr. Bushnell in the light of my personal recollections of him. With this I am greatly content, not only because I am consciously more competent — or less incompetent — to speak of him from that than from other points of view; but, also, for the reason that my predominant impression of him is that derived from my private acquaintance and intercourse with him. His traits and ways, the play of his mind, the motions of his spirit, as observed in the hours and days of companionship with him which I was permitted to share, naturally supply the thought of him that first rises in me at mention of his name. On that account he is, and must ever remain to me, not so much the great man that he was, as the dear man that he was.

In what I shall now say of him I shall of course repeat things I have told before on other occasions, and that some of you have heard, but that will be no matter.

Having been born and brought up in this neighborhood I was from my childhood accustomed to hear Dr. Bushnell a good deal spoken of. I was but a lad when at a Sunday-school convention — I think it was — in Plainville to which my father took me with him, I first saw him and heard him preach. The sermon I have always supposed — for some forgotten reason — was one of the Christian Nurture series. Nothing definite about it do I recall. I vaguely see a slight-built man in the pulpit, turning the leaves of his manuscript and speaking with energy. I probably understood little if anything that he said, but I distinctly remember father, who was given to thinking aloud, saying to himself again and again with strong emphasis as we drove home in the dark, "That was great preaching — great preaching!"

My next memory of him is clearer. The summer of my junior year in college in 1858, my classmate, George Dunham, of this city, a splendid fellow and a parishioner of Dr. Bushnell's, while as member of the Yale boat-crew preparing for that year's rowing contest with Harvard, was drowned at Springfield. The funeral

was in Hartford, and our whole class came up to it. It was held in the old North Church. Dr. Bushnell at that time was utterly broken down in health, and the brief address he made — following Dr. Buckingham of Springfield — was a moving one, but was marked by pathetic signs of bodily weakness. He seemed hardly able to speak at all, and looked as if he had not long to live. He was to live eighteen years longer, and in those years, as we know, to accomplish no small share of his life work; but no one then, judging from appearances, would have thought such a thing possible.

It was not till five or six years later, during the Civil War, that being home on leave of absence from the army and visiting Hartford, I was taken to his house by a friend and introduced to him. In circumstances that I need not delay to explain, I was, at that time for a couple of days, a good deal with him; sat once or twice at his table; went with him to his mid-week meeting, and spoke to his people of my work as army chaplain. Then it was that I took my first real sense of him, began to discern the manner of spirit he was of, and fell in love with him.

Subsequently, when I was back with my regiment, I had a letter from him, more than one, I believe, which I wish I had kept. Whenever afterward I was in Hartford I called on him, eagerly embracing every opportunity to do so, because I wanted much to see him for the pleasure of it.

So it was — and this is why I bring in what I have just been telling — that when in 1865 I came to Hartford to live, there was no circumstance of the situation that I prized more than that it included nearness to Dr. Bushnell. I strongly felt this to be an auspicious circumstance. I was convinced that hardly anything beside was better for me, was more likely to be to me a means of grace, was more likely to profit me for my work in the ministry, than the company of that man. I had seen enough of him and had experienced enough of the effect of personal contact with him to persuade me of that. Of the magnitudes comprehended in him I was incapable of taking the measure; but no human being save my father, who was then in heaven, had ever seemed to stir in me the desire and the purpose of living the true life as he had done.

The thoughts that were uppermost with me at that juncture, you, my brethren in the ministry, in the light of your own memories, will understand. They concerned my spiritual furnishing for

the pastoral office. I was conscious of sad deficiency at that point, of lack of piety, of lack of consecration. Dr. Bushnell, I hoped and believed, would help me up out of that poverty. That was what I most wanted of him.

Up to that time, of his distinctive theology I had no knowledge whatsoever. I was aware, of course, that it had been the occasion of controversy, but that was all I knew about it. The only book of his I had read was "Nature and the Supernatural." My own theological views, so far as I could be said to have any, were those of the seminary lectures I had heard. I was quite innocent of a disposition to question them, or to think for myself on theological subjects. This might be, perhaps, somewhat explained. We were not much occupied with theology in the Army of the Potomac.

My condition of ignorance relative to matters of so deep concern to himself, and which, after all allowance made, was the reverse of creditable, the Doctor must have seen, but he gave no sign of it. He made no attempt to disturb my acquiescent repose in regular orthodoxy.

I do remember, though, that when, upon the expiration of my term of military service, I told him that I was going to Andover to brush up my theology, he said he thought it hardly worth while, since the first thing I would have to do after brushing it up would be to get rid of a good deal of it.

The fire of the controversy about him was, when I came to Hartford, burning low, though by the publication of "The Vicarious Sacrifice" it would be rekindled the next year. Enough of it, however, was smoldering to cause a prominent member of the church that had called me to the pastorate, when he learned that I had named Dr. Bushnell among those I had asked to have invited to the installing council, to remonstrate with me very earnestly against his being so invited; for the reason, as he expressed it, that he had outraged the feeling of the Christian community by his false teaching. I was not, as I have stated, posted on the matters he referred to, but the incident was highly embarrassing to me. I very much disliked to offend the objector, who had been forward in procuring my call to the church and who was one of the best of men. But I stuck — unhesitatingly, as I am glad to be able to testify — and insisted that the Doctor should be on the council, and did it because I thought so much of him. It scares me now to think — what if I had given way? But, really, I was

in no danger of it. When, in my subsequent examination before the council, a doctrinal collision between Dr. Bushnell and Dr. Hawes occurred over my head in the form of questions addressed to me as candidate, I comprehended nothing in the least of the import of it. I had crammed my lectures and I got through.

Naturally in the first year of my residence in Hartford I was in the way of learning many things concerning Dr. Bushnell from those who had been observant of his career—in some cases from its beginning—which, as may be supposed, I had an ear to hear. By certain of my parishioners in particular who had been his parishioners, I had rehearsed to me the story of his active pastorate, of how he had appeared when in the plenitude of his physical vigor, and how he carried on his work in the church. I remarked that such accounts tended in the main to emphasize the phenomena of the spiritual inspirations that had proceeded from him as minister and leader of his flock. The effect of particular sermons of his was often spoken of. One man, I recall, said of a sermon from the text “He that is not for me is against me,” “it went through us like grapeshot.”

From the Doctor himself also I gathered much regarding the former days, and with him, too, the recollections of them were pre-vaillingly religious and spiritual. He had comparatively little to say of the wars he had passed through.

Of the general stimulating effect of his preaching frequent mention was made. A leading business man of the city told me that when he was a youth, his employer—a parishioner of the Doctor’s—used to come into his store Monday mornings and clapping his hands with a gesture of exhilaration say to his partners and clerks, “You ought to have been at our church yesterday! You would have heard one of the greatest sermons ever preached!” Then, walking up and down, he would give them the outline and substance of the sermon, kindling with enthusiasm as he went on, and wind up with, “Now let’s do a big week’s work!”

Mr. Austin Dunham, in his time one of Hartford’s most honored and enterprising citizens—a parishioner of the Doctor’s he too—once remarked to me that in no other way had Dr. Bushnell done so much for Hartford as in making men. “The fact is,” he said, “he taught men to think large thoughts, to use their minds. He put into them the notion of amounting to something, of accom-

plishing something, which in many cases accounted in large degree for what they did amount to and accomplish."

It was one of the Doctor's sayings, once repeated to me in application to myself, that a cardinal obligation of every man was to make as much of a man of himself as he could.

From numerous sources I received all that loving and loyal memories could contribute to help me frame a lively conception of him as he had been in his mighty prime.

Still, Horace Bushnell the aged, the prey of wasting disease, his outward man perishing, his speech in ruins, is, and will ever be, my Horace Bushnell after all. Those conditions, I mean, are present in the portrait of his exterior person as his image rises before me. They were, I need not say, of the body only. Never, in mind and spirit, was he more alive than in his declining years. It was always a marvel to see how that inner life dominated the physical in him. Sick man as he was he did not seem like a sick man. He would not be invalided any more than he could possibly help. He was full of the impulse of action — of the athletic impulse, you might say. There was no end to his pluck. If you were going to climb a mountain he would go along with you. "Hold on there!" he would call out if your pace exceeded what his scant breath could support; "Not quite so fast! Remember you have lungs and I haven't!" But he never gave up.

Though my opportunity of acquaintance with him came so late, and after he had in one sense quit the stage of action, it was not therefore, as regards my being put in the way of knowing him, a deficient one. For if ever there was a man who was entirely himself and like himself in all circumstances it was he. In the lighter operations of his mind and in the minor expressions of his moral nature his fundamental characteristics were illustrated in a degree, I think, exceptional. His traits of originality and independence, for instance, were universal in their scope. When he chose the site of his house on Winthrop street he chose it with reference, for one thing, to the wide view it afforded. He wanted to be where he could see a good way, he said. And he chose it before there was any street there. The street had to come to him. That was Bushnell in theology and in everything. Place him where you might he struck out for himself. What was established had small force of authority with him because it was established. Up in the Adirondack region, where I spent a vacation with him in the

summer of 1868, there was a route which parties desiring to visit certain natural phenomena of interest lying back a distance in the wilderness had always taken. The Doctor had not been there three days, before, by studying the lay of the land and the map, he made up his mind that another, less circuitous one, was feasible. It was a sort of heresy in the premises, but he was persuaded of the soundness of his view ; and nothing would do but I must set out with him and put it to proof.

On that exploration we took with us for guides and porters two men who were experts in woodcraft and who had long dwelt among those mountains. But no sooner were we under way than it became evident that as for being guided by them in the sense of saying, "Go ahead, and we will follow," the doctor had no such idea. From the moment we got fairly into the woods he insisted on knowing from them the exact why and wherefore of every turn that was made. Their reports of the direction in which we were at any time traveling he invariably tested by the compass. And when his judgment and theirs in any particular crossed, as not infrequently happened, there was a halt for argument. At one point we became involved ere we were aware in the oozy mazes of a tamarack swamp, necessitating a pause to look about us and see what was the best way to get back to firm ground. I did all I could to make the Doctor sit still and let the guides do the reconnoitering required to settle the matter. But, no, he could not delegate a function of that nature, and so he went plunging back and forth, charged with the whole responsibility of the situation, till the problem was solved. His exertions, however, together with a jar he had received from slipping on a wet log, presently brought on a hemorrhage from the lungs, of which I knew nothing till, as he walked before me, he turned and said, "Look here!" showing me a mouthful of blood he had thrown upon the ground. I was aghast. "We must stop at once!" I said. "No, no," he answered, "don't tell the guides. It isn't serious and I would rather move along." But by the time we went into camp, an hour or so later, he was perceptibly weak. During the night he continued to raise blood and grew feverish and slept hardly any, while to complete the misery of his plight it came on to rain. In the morning he was quite unable to proceed. I was, of course, desperately uneasy, and knew not what to do, for it was miles to any house. But he took it quietly. He lay still under the bough shelter through the

day — the rain happily had ceased — forbidding me to go or send for help, as I begged him to let me, telling me not to worry and that he would be all right soon. Toward evening he felt better, and that night he had a pretty good sleep. Next morning he rose, stirred about a little, ate some breakfast, and said cheerily, "Well, I'm on foot again; today we will march." Naturally I had no thought under the circumstances of marching anywhere but to the nearest place where a conveyance could be had to take us back to where we came from, and in some way I implied that. Whereupon to my equal astonishment and dismay he said, "No, indeed! We are not going back; we are going on — unless you back out." He would hear to nothing else. Accordingly on we went, and tramped three days more, and returned in the end with his doctrine of the new route completely demonstrated.

Oh, what boundless stuff of grit and courage was in him!

His engineering faculty was constitutional and was always awake. I have heard him tell that when in 1856 he was in California for his health, the question of the route by which the Pacific railroad — then only a project — should enter California was in debate. Stranger and invalid as he was the Doctor took a keen interest in it, and as he journeyed up and down had an eye to that matter and reached a conclusion upon it. When at last the road was built it pleased him not a little that his route was the one adopted. For another incident of that California visit, that will be in place here, he told me that traveling in the wilder portion of the state he one day, while by chance separated from his party, came, as he supposed, near to an encounter with a grizzly bear. He thought he heard one crashing through the underbrush and making directly for him. It was a portentous sound, he said, that sent the blood back to his heart. But what he did in the emergency was to get out a big pocket-knife he carried and open it and stand ready to defend himself as best he could. An instinctive expression, it was, of his spirit of self-reliance.

No work of his, it is often and truly said, more strikingly illustrates the original cast of his genius than his invention — for it was an invention — of the Park yonder which bears his name. Some things he related to me of the history of it I recall. He would recur with glee to the general skepticism and ridicule which his first broaching of the idea of it provoked, the public imagina-

tion being quite unequal to the conception of such a thing as the proposed transformation of what was the unsightliest portion of the city. I can hear the laugh with which he told how, on a fire having just then destroyed one of the ramshackle buildings that stood on the ground included in his plan, he had received a letter intimating that the said fire was of his procuring, to cheapen the purchase price of the property.

This, too, I had from his own lips ; that after a committee had been raised to report on the feasibility of the scheme, Mr. D. F. Robinson, an eminent citizen who was its leading member, announced to him that, while for himself he favored it, the expense of carrying it out was so great that he much feared, when it came to a popular vote, it would fail of approval. He therefore judged it expedient to be content with trying to secure what is now the western section of the park, and to let the rest go. To which he had replied: "Mr. Robinson, I think you are mistaken. Things are often made practicable by being made difficult. Human nature is such that in many cases the more considerable the enterprise to which you challenge a community, the more likely you are to get it adopted. In my opinion it is safer to ask for the whole than for the half." This view Mr. Robinson and the committee in the end accepted and ventured to submit a proposition to the people that was at the time fairly heroic; and the Doctor's prophecy came true.

Another thing I remember his telling that is of a similar illustrative significance. When in 1873 the city had appropriated a section of the park for the site of a new State Capitol, upon its becoming known that he regretted the fact and had views of his own respecting a site for the Capitol, he was, from a feeling of what was due him, invited to present those views to his fellow citizens at a public meeting called for the purpose the next day. By the way, when he was at this time reminded that one of the reasons he had originally advanced for the creation of the Park was that some day a site for a capitol would be wanted and there it would be, he brushed the suggestion aside, saying that that was years ago and meanwhile he had been growing and knew more than he did then. The offer of the hearing which I have referred to touched him deeply, but he was in a very weak condition and doubted if he could possibly avail himself of it. "But," he said, "thinking myself specially charged with the care of some things

in Hartford, I answered that I would if I could. I would wait and see." That night he had such a quiet sleep as he had not had for weeks, and on the strength of it went to the meeting and said his say. His site for the Capitol was the height overlooking the Park on the west, where the High School now stands. While it was not chosen; of that meeting came the purchase of the Trinity College grounds to build the Capitol on, and the saving of the park whole, and more.

Afterward, when the foundations of the Capitol were being laid, meeting him one day on the street he said to me: "They are not putting that Capitol in the right place. It ought to stand two hundred feet further south, and if I was well enough I'd get it moved now."

A thing in Dr. Bushnell—and the thing I might say above every other—that was impressed upon me from the beginning of my acquaintance with him was his perfect truth. One saw and felt from being with him that truth was the element in which he lived. The principle of it ran all through him to his finger ends. He never moved a hand, so to speak, that he did not manifest it. Truth with him was not religious truth particularly, but a universal thing. In whatever shape it came before him he recognized it and rejoiced in it. Going with him, not long before he passed away, into one of our great insurance buildings then in course of construction and nearly completed, our attention was drawn to a huge door just finished. The Doctor inspected it with care, opened and shut it, saw how nicely its ponderous weight was balanced, how perfectly it fitted its frame, examined it all round, and finally patting it with his hand said in a tone of most earnest satisfaction: "There! That is a piece of truth, and the man who made it is a true man!"

In his judgment of men he set a higher mark on honesty in the whole range of its application, it seemed to me, than any one I had ever known. For opinions on all subjects, no matter how narrow and mistaken, so that they were honest, he had boundless toleration. Great was his delight when one of the Adirondack natives, whose acquaintance he made, a worthy soul, a solid Christian, confided to him in conversation his utter skepticism of the truth of the Copernican system of astronomy, — in particular of the rotundity and orbital motion of the earth, — alleging not only its unscripturalness, but that it contradicted his lifelong observation.

"I respect him," said the Doctor. "He don't believe in the Copernican system, but anyhow he is well grounded in the Ptolemaic, and he goes by it. It tells him accurately enough when it is time in the morning to get up."

His own quality and practice of truth were answerable to his large sort of recognition of it. It was an omnipresent veracity; the reigning law of his mind and heart. He did not seem to know how to be otherwise than simply and absolutely straightforward. One could not think that in uttering his mind he ever on any occasion considered prudentially the consequences to himself. I do not believe he ever did.

Never can I forget his witness concerning himself which it was once given me to hear. We were angling together on a mountain stream. I had happened to tell him what some one had recently told me of his obligation to him for aid in keeping the Christian faith, and had remarked that it must be a comfort to him to know that there were many to whom he had been the means of that sort of help. Whereupon he turned and faced me, and in a manner of utmost seriousness — almost solemnity — replied: "The only thing that gives me the least comfort in myself is that I know and can testify that I have above all things else desired to know the truth," — or those were very nearly his words as shortly after I recalled them. They stand together somehow in my thoughts of him with what he said to me of himself on another occasion not far from the same time. Again I had been remarking, more or less foolishly I presume, — I remember the very spot, it was on Asylum street, between here and the railroad station — on the satisfaction he must derive from the evidences coming to him of the good he had done. He rebuked me and said: "The wonder to me is that God has been so patient with me; that He has borne with me as He has." And he spoke very humbly. I apprehend a deep interior harmony of meaning in the two sayings.

To the search for truth which had consciously been his sovereign quest went not alone the labor of intellectual inquiry, but as indispensably a temper of spirit suited to its nature. My Brother Parker remembers, as do I, our once speaking to him of a certain book that had just appeared arraigning the Princeton theology in points in which it was specially obnoxious to him. We asked him if he had read it. He had. Did he like it? No, he

did not. Why? we demanded, in some surprise. "The book," he said, "is able, and it is well enough argued, but it isn't written in a good spirit." In all the years I knew him, I never, that I can recall, heard him utter a word that had the least tinge of bitterness in it toward any of his opponents, even those whose bitterness toward him had been most extreme. I once sat with him in an ecclesiastical council — I cannot delay to tell when or where, and I wouldn't anyway — during the open proceedings of which language of a downrightly unkind and offensive description was by one individual used toward him. When presently the council was in private session, the offender being absent, the Doctor took occasion to say of him — and he did it with perfect gentleness — that he was a great deal better man than the brethren might imagine from hearing him.

In this all comprehensive truth-love of his, including both mind and heart, to which his genius was ever subject, was there not fulfilled the eminent condition of fruitful discovery in the field of things spiritual, according to our Saviour's words: "If thine eye be single thy whole body shall be full of light"?

Another condition of it which he fulfilled was the rigorous rule he exercised over himself physically — his temperance in the Christian meaning, of which I early took note. He was, indeed, no ascetic. He enjoyed the common pleasures of life with ardent relish. He delighted in social intercourse. He had a quick sense of humor. He could laugh. He was fond of a horse. Nature was full of charm to him. President Porter told me of his once saying to him of a landscape in his native New Preston which, as seen from a certain point of outlook, he had felt the remarkable beauty of in his boyhood, that though he had viewed it times without number, it had never, with every fresh survey, failed to disclose to him some feature of delight which was new, which he was conscious of not having discerned in it before. "That," said President Porter, "was the mark of a great mind." But highly capable of such delectations as he was, and much as he relished them, you could not be with him long without perceiving that there was nothing he more despised or put further from him than the self-indulgent habit. As relates to winning knowledge of the highest truth especially, it was the first article of his creed that no one who consulted ease could prosper. To such a one there could

be no revelation. If you would be wise in heavenly understanding, like Daniel you must refuse the king's dainties. He kept that law as the inexorable law of spiritual insight. In connection with his quest of truth he practiced fasting, — on occasion I have heard him say — even to the extent of not looking into a newspaper for days together, that he might clear the windows of his soul; and to him who was wont so intently to watch the beating of the heart of the world's life that was a stern abstinence.

"Fasting," he said, "is saying to the body with all its passions and to the lower mind with all its pettiness, 'Go down there and stay till I call you, and leave me alone.'"

So he set himself to understand and chastened himself before his God.

Few of my recollections of him are so dear, and none are more precious, than of his prayers; pre-eminently of some I heard him offer in the sanctuary of nature. One of these in particular is deep-graven in my memory. We had spent an afternoon toiling up a trail that followed the course of an Adirondack mountain brook, our plan being to camp out over night and fish down the brook the next day. Our destination was a certain cascade — called ever since Bushnell Falls — away up on the side of Mt. Marcy, which we reached a little before sundown. The Doctor was thoroughly fatigued with his climb, and so I found him a seat beside the basin pool below the falls, and rigged out a rod for him and left him to catch trout for supper — which he did in sufficiency, though he said he was too tired to see the water — while I prepared our bed and made a fire. When it came time to get into our blankets we had a few verses from the New Testament (if it was not this time it was another such time that when I had read the seventeenth chapter of John he said: "There's a subject for you. Show how impossible it is that that is a human production"), and then I asked him to pray. He turned partly over on his face — he was lying down — and began in his natural voice but with a tone as soft and melodious as the low murmur of the stream beneath, what seemed for all the world like speaking to some one who was next to him, but whom I did not see. And so he continued communing in expressions of adoring thanks and love and humility and trust and blessed hope with that near Presence, till, when he ceased, I found every other thought swallowed up in the

feeling that God was there. There was in it all the vivid suggestion, the reflection, of a long and dear acquaintance fraught with holy memories—as, indeed, there was—between him and his God—his God in Christ. For it was to God in Christ that he prayed then and always. And I am reminded here of his once telling me how, at the time the charges of heresy were being pressed against him, it was said to him by prominent Unitarians whom he met, I think, in Boston: “Bushnell, why submit to be buffeted by those Connecticut ministers? You belong with us; why not say so and join us?” and how he made reply: “Gentlemen, I am much mistaken by many, but by none so much as by you. I don’t belong with you, but the farthest possible otherwise, if you only knew it.” Is there any one but will say that time has completely verified that statement?

I surely never knew a man who seemed to believe more in believing in Christ than did Horace Bushnell. He used to say that the difference between him and those who would have cast him out of the evangelical fellowship was not that he believed less than they did but that he believed more. Nothing is more certain than that the faith of Christ was from first to last the vitalizer and nourisher of his genius. And there was ever an intimate relation of correspondence between the history of his thought as a Christian theologian and the history of his personal spiritual experience as a Christian man.

But it is time I brought these reminiscences to a close.

As at length the day drew near that would part him from us it was evident that the things unseen were growing to him the only substantial realities. “How are you, Doctor?” said a friend who met him while he was still able to crawl out of doors. “Almost gone!” “Well, how do feel about it?” “I can hardly tell,” was the reply, “except that as to this dying we make so much of I have come to think that there isn’t much to it.” He was full of great cheer. To an old parishioner, of whose imminent departure hence he had learned—it was the very man whose manner of going into his store Monday mornings and reporting the previous day’s sermon I told about—he wrote, “You will hardly have time to turn round before I am with you,” adding with other words of congratulation, “to be with Christ and rest in Him where He rests; how full and free and tender is this hope!”

Gentler or sweeter leave-taking than his there could not be. Some scenes of it are to some of us forever memorable. One of them I may relate. It occurred at a meeting of the Ministerial Association of which he was a member, and the last, my impression is, that he attended.

He had been appointed to read a sermon at this meeting. When it was called for he took out his manuscript and as he smoothed it in his hands quietly remarked: "Brethren, the sermon I am going now to read you is, I suppose, the last I shall ever write. My subject is, Our Relations to Christ in the Future Life." He began to read. With awed and quivering hearts we listened till he ceased. Then, according to custom, the moderator called on us in order for our criticism of the sermon. But, as you would expect, no one felt like talking. Those called on first said a word or two of approval—nothing more—till it came Dr. Burton's turn, and he shook his head.

"Oh, say something," cried the Doctor to him. "I want to know what you think about it." "Well," said Dr. Burton, "perhaps I ought to," and after a long pause he began. "The Doctor—says—that—this is his last sermon—" then suddenly put his hands over his face and burst into loud weeping; and we all wept with him. Old men were there who had stood by the Doctor in his dark days, and young men whose love for him was new, and every spirit alike was overwhelmed with a sense of pathos that was inexpressible except by tears. And the Doctor—he sat there in the midst, his own eyes wet, but his face shining like an angel's; beholding us with a look of blessing that seemed to reflect the very light and love of heaven.

Again and again did he bid good-by after this fashion to those of his earthly fellowship, telling them that soon they should see his face no more. till while they were still talking with him, lo, he was gone.

I do not know how better I can end than with a few extracts from my diary which refer to Dr. Bushnell in his last days. They are not much, but such as they are, they are from the life and have a certain interest on that account which will plead my apology for introducing them. I may explain that I did not begin to keep a diary till the autumn of 1874. How often have I wished that I had begun with it earlier, and so have preserved many and many a thing he said and did, now gone beyond recall.

The first is of date Nov. 8, 1874, less than a year and a half before his death, and is this :

“ Dr. Bushnell in church. He came up into the pulpit after sermon and pronounced the benediction.

And these, with only slight alterations, mainly for clearness, are the others :

March 15, 1875.

“ Called to inquire after Dr. Bushnell, who has had a bad turn and was feared to be going at last. Found that he was a little better, so much so that I was permitted to go up and see him. The dear old man lay on a couch in his study and when he saw me coming reached out his hand and hailed me in a bright, cheery, half-humorous and very loving tone, calling me by my first name. I stayed not many seconds and did not say much ; neither did he ; but I felt vastly refreshed when I went out. He said to his wife a day or two ago as she was trying to do something for him, ‘ It’s a pretty delicate matter to nurse an old fellow who doesn’t know whether he wants to get well or not, isn’t it ? ’ He has, during this sickness, shown an interest and pleasure in flowers in degree quite new to him. He says that this is the first opportunity he ever had to take time to look at them. I remarked that I was glad to hear that he had taken to flowers. ‘ Oh, no,’ he answered, ‘ they’ve taken to me, they look at me.’ ”

April 5, 1875.

“ One of Dr. Bushnell’s daughters said to him the other day, ‘ It must be very hard for you to lie here, Father. You show a great deal of patience.’ ‘ Well,’ replied the Doctor, ‘ I’ve got a great deal of weakness to support it.’ ”

April 16, 1875.

“ Met Dr. Bushnell on the street (I was on my way to see him) and walked with him over an hour. He is sadly feeble, having to stop once in a while to rest, but unchanged in the freshness of his spirit and the interest of his thoughts. He said that he wanted to write a book on Inspiration, yet had not the physical strength for it. We talked of his using an amanuensis, but he doubted if he could to advantage, or any way. Finally he said that the mental tension involved in composing on any wise was more than his body could sustain. He had thought somewhat of talking the subject over with some friend and letting him do the writing. But who could ? ”

Jan. 27, 1876.

“ Spent part of the forenoon with Dr. Bushnell. It was mournful to see how feeble he has grown, but I felt a sense of Christian triumph in beholding the quietness that possessed him.”

Feb. 5, 1876. [This is the last. He died only twelve days after.]

“Called to see Dr. Bushnell and found him unable to receive company. Alas, I fear I shall never behold his face in this life again.

“Had a long talk with Mrs. Bushnell, who seemed to me in a more exalted frame of Christian feeling than I had ever witnessed in anyone before. Felt as I left the house a mighty conviction of spiritual realities and a desire to live in them.”

So concludes the record. I am glad that the final sentence of it introduces, and introduces as it does, so fitly, mention of one whom Dr. Bushnell himself ever accounted the principal earthly light of his life and source of its inspirations — his noble wife, in God's kind providence still with us. The intimation it conveys regarding her is true. But, “felt a mighty conviction of spiritual realities and a desire to live in them,” tells and sums up in a word the effect most memorable to me that proceeded from my personal companionship and communion with Horace Bushnell from first to last.

"HORACE BUSHNELL—CHRISTIAN PROPHET"

BY EDWIN POND PARKER

As St. Paul described himself in his salutation to the saints at Rome, so, changing one word, we may describe Horace Bushnell : " A servant of Jesus Christ, called to be a prophet, separated unto the Gospel of God."

The two fundamental elements of prophecy are insight and expression. Christian prophecy implies insight or discernment of spiritual things by divine illumination, and expression of them, by inspiration, in terms of Christian truth or in the tones and cadences of Christian testimony. We may define it, then, as the publication, under the impulse of inspiration, and for edification, of truths perceived by divine illumination, apprehended by faith and assimilated by experience.

Moreover, Christian prophecy requires a natural basis and rational preparations in the human mind ; aptitudes, fertilities, and inspirabilities in which to nest itself ; a suitable stock of natural gifts on which to graft its spiritual gift for support and nourishment. All the fresh and spontaneous up-spring and out-flow of its intuitions, all its insight and utterance, imply prepossessions of moral strength and intellectual power, and manifold preparation by culture and discipline. The prophet, then, is one qualified for his calling by certain original inspirabilities, moral and intellectual, and by his devout culture of them, and further qualified by illuminations and inspirations crowning all his outfit and preparation, for the revelation in him and the proclamation by him of divine messages.

Again, because insight gives foresight, the prophet will be a seer of things as they are unfolding and becoming ; will discern far-signalings and intimations of Providence ; will fore-run men to prepare the way for them and them for the way of God's coming kingdom. His anticipative views will seem visionary and his

heraldings will encounter incredulity and resistance on their part who, facing to the past, live by memory and tradition. Wherefore, he must be a man of confidence, courage, and self-control.

Fundamental among Dr. Bushnell's inspirabilities was the truthfulness of his moral nature. He had a great conscience—which he called the "oracle-faculty"—and he revered and obeyed it

"As God's most intimate Presence in the soul,
And his most perfect image in the world."

The great power of his personality rested ultimately on this solid foundation. By this all-pervading genuineness and truthfulness he was prepared for his pursuit of truth, his passion for it, and for inhabitation and illumination by the very Spirit of Truth.

Dr. Bushnell was intellectually susceptible to prophetic inspiration both because this truthfulness ruled his mind, and because those mental faculties which have most affinity with such inspiration were predominant in him. He possessed in remarkable measure those powers of insight and expression which in the realm of things intellectual mark the men of prophetic genius. He had a vital, original, fertile, versatile mind; sane, serene, hopeful, cheerful, and honest as the light to which its windows were wide open. But he had a mind for exploration and discovery, intent on getting through the crust to the inside and marrow of things; intuitive, ingenious, and inventive. He foresaw and predicted the use of electricity as a motive power, marked the route of railroads, showed how a veritable Paradise could be made of the squalidest portion of his city, and built his own house where he might have large views and see a great way off.

Above all, he had "the vision and the faculty divine", with its power of perceiving, apprehending, and representing truth, as he has described it in the noble essay, "The Gospel a Gift To The Imagination"; its intuitions and outlooks, its wealth of imagery and analogy, its transfigurations of thought, and its supreme command of language wherewith to set all troops and trains of thought in suitable and splendid order and array. His mind, so constituted, was a magnificent organ for the interpretation of Christian truth, needing only the revelation of that truth, and, therewith,

Divine inspiration flowing through all its faculties and voicing them, to break forth into grand and moving strains of Christian prophecy.

Again, in Dr. Bushnell the spirit of the prophet was ever subject to the prophet. It never ran away with him nor upset him, nor set him up in any vain confidence or show. He had himself in splendid self-control—body, mind, and spirit. Whether footing or winging his way, he moved right on without flurry or flightiness, poising all buoyances of thought and spirit with sound judgment and solid sense.

In his essay on "Work and Play" he distinguishes courage from bravery, defining the former as "the greatness of a great heart; the repose and confidence of a man whose soul is rested in truth and principle."

He possessed that sort of courage, with its equanimity and magnanimity. He quietly nailed his theses to the gates of Harvard, Yale, and Andover, not ignorant of what would come of it, and through all the tumult that ensued seemed not only undismayed but unperturbed. At the Diet of Litchfield, where his clerical life seemed in jeopardy, he conquered as much by the composure as by the courage with which he refused to retract or modify what he had written. "To me", he said, "they are truths such as I must violate my own well-being and my spiritual integrity before God, not to embrace, profess, and, with what ability I have, to maintain."

To understand Dr. Bushnell's further preparation for his prophetic gift and service, one must consider that way of experience in which he was conducted through doubts and difficulties into his joyful and permanent possession of Christian faith and truth. Prenatally consecrated to the Gospel ministry by a godly mother whose subsequent and judicious guidance he gratefully recognized as God's way with his soul, he was a child of Christian nurture. His epoch-making treatise on that subject reflects, no doubt, the experiences of his own childhood and youth. He also received impressions of the beauty and majesty of God through a delight in the natural world which grew with his growth. The youth of seventeen years, while tending a carding machine, wrestles with the ninth chapter of Romans, and writes out his conclusions. "The Lord in his tender mercy led me to Jesus", is the tender record of his experience at the age of nineteen years. He joined

the church, observed its ordinances, and maintained a singular blamelessness of conduct. He never denied the genuineness of that conversion, but, in old age, significantly said of it: "It is not wonderful that a Christian life begun in such crudity required many turns of loss and recovery to ripen it." The severe and protracted trial of his faith which ensued should be regarded as "the turns of loss and recovery" requisite to ripen it. The wintry weather which stripped the tree of its foliage and left it dead to outward appearance did not kill it, and in due time and vernal season it put forth abundant foliage, blossoms, and fruit.

We find him, a year after graduation from college, obstructed in the way of preparation for the ministry by declension of religious life and unbelief. The gentle remonstrances of his mother induced him to suspend a decision to enter the legal profession, and to accept a tutorial appointment at Yale, where, in a better religious atmosphere, he was to "think himself out of his overthinking, and discover how far above reason is trust." The interesting and instructive story of his recovery of faith there, outlined in the memorable sermon on "The Dissolving of Doubts", must not detain us. The long and painful struggle had been, from first to last, a struggle *to believe*; to find something wholly believable; to feel the rock underfoot; and to get in touch with things real and vital. He could not adjust his mind to the standard religious doctrines of his day, and as they fell away, he found or fancied himself in destitution of truth. At last he lighted on the way to the truth and promptly took it.

Wayfaring thus, and repeating the patriarch's experience, he found himself wrestling with a divine friend and not a foe, gave over the vain contention, and, clinging to him with whom he had striven, sought and obtained his blessing. Nevertheless, with this daybreak and blessing came no comfort or satisfaction in the prevalent orthodoxy. "The bed was shorter than that a man could stretch himself upon it, and the covering narrower than that he could wrap himself in it." As late as the time of his settlement in Hartford he had, as he confesses, "many and great difficulties on hand in respect to Gospel truths", and a "very slender furniture" for his work. Looking back from the standpoint of the twentieth anniversary of his settlement, the only things in the list of his qualifications at that time which moved

his respect were "a mustard-seed of Christian experience," and "an honest determination to find the truth." He was even then "coming into religion on the side of reason or philosophy," having "small conception of it as a faith and a supernatural gift." Faithfully prosecuting the work confided to him, and diligently and devoutly pursuing his studies, at last "he beat his music out." The time came—it was in the opening days of what was a New Year indeed to him—when Dr. Bushnell heard and obeyed the prophetic and welcome call: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee!" He has told us some things about it, and his wife, who was waiting with him for that light, has supplied an account of it. He suddenly saw, as never before, and with glad surprise, the Gospel! "I seemed to pass a boundary, from partial seeings, glimpses, and doubts, into a closer knowledge of God and into his inspirations which I have never lost." "Christianity is opened to me now as a new heaven of truth, wide as the firmament, luminous, clear, and glorious." "The great mystery of godliness mirrored in the heart by an inward revelation of Christ."

"It all came to him", says Mrs. Bushnell, "after all his thought and study, not as something reasoned out, but as by inspiration—a revelation from the mind of God." Yes, after all his thought and study, but as God's benediction upon it all. For this great and crowning experience Dr. Bushnell had been preparing, in all his training, in all his toil of thought and study, in all his mental struggles, in all his resolutely honest conflicts and turns of loss and recovery, and in all his discipline of trials and sorrow. It was God's way with his prophetic soul. It may be said, also, that there had been presages as well as desires and expectations of this experience. The full May foliage of his faith had prophesied this abundant June blossoming of it, and given an earnest of great future fruitfulness. Thus came to Dr. Bushnell the heavenly vision and its revelations of divine truths to his spiritual understanding so prepared to receive and then to proclaim them. Thus came upon him, as to Eldad and Medad of old, in the camp, the prophetic gift; and as upon Elisha ploughing in his field, so upon this man at his toil and "ploughing in uses" the prophet's mantle was cast, and straightway he began to prophesy, in sermons, addresses, and books, to the delight and edification of many, and to the sore perplexity and displeasure of others.

That year of 1848 was one of extraordinary intellectual productivity. During the summer he delivered the magnificent oration on "Work and Play", at Harvard, and the three theological addresses—"On the Atonement", at Cambridge, "On the Divinity of Christ", at New Haven, "On Dogma and Spirit", at Andover—which, with the fundamental "Dissertation on Language", were published soon after in the book entitled "God in Christ." An immediate, fierce, and general assault, "like the winds from the four quarters of the heaven", was made upon these alleged heresies, and persistent efforts were made to dislodge their author from his ministerial office and fellowship. These things we here dismiss with the single remark that when the windy storm and tempest were overpast, no disastrous effects were observable, but a wholesome clearance of the air, in which the truths uttered by Dr. Bushnell stood forth, if not in triumph, yet, as he had predicted, "having time on their side and God in company."

Called to speak out and set forth in rational forms his fertile indoctrinations, and with this "strong lift in his religious experience coming as a waft upon his inspirations", it was inevitable that he should do some noteworthy theologizing of his own, in some part critical and negative, but for the most part positive and fulfilling.

Few will question the immense suggestiveness and helpfulness of this theologizing, but a great, if not the chief value of it is the all-pervading spirit of prophecy in the testimony of Jesus—the warmth and glow, the spiritual earnestness, the liturgical fervor and force of a great Christian faith and experience. Dr. Bushnell was not concerned with defining, articulating, and systematizing truths, but with setting forth their vital meanings and their relations to reality. In the introduction to "The Vicarious Sacrifice" he says: "I do not propose to establish any article whatever in this treatise, but only to exhibit, if possible, the loving, helpful, transforming, sanctifying Christ, the true soul-bread from heaven, the quickening life, the power of God unto salvation." So speaks the prophet in the theologian. All his strictly theological work was a means to this higher end for which he had truth in hand. His chief interest in that truth was neither intellectual nor theological, but human. Wherever his books have been read they have conveyed this impression, not only of theologic ingenuity in giving to old truths some new embodiment and garb, but of spiritual origin-

ality and prophetic instrumentality in resuscitating them and showing them forth in newness of life and so in newness of form and vesture, as at the word of an ancient prophet the dry bones of the valley became a living host. Nothing was more characteristic of Dr. Bushnell than just this *vividness*—of thought, feeling, imagination, and expression—vividness that vivified! To a correspondent who had expressed admiration for the strong and beautiful things in his books concerning forgiveness he wrote: "They all were distilled in the alembic of my own experience." To another correspondent who wondered at his power of expression he said: "Finding the air full of wings about me, buoyant and free, I let them come under and lift."

The result is a vivid and unique forthsetting of truth in forms of thought and language worthy of it, touched with the affections of God, powerful over the souls of men, but always suggestive of more than is or can be told. A music of the Gospel, melodious and symphonic, sounds through sermon and treatise and essay; and we find him, as he found St. Paul, "not so much theologizing as flaming in the holy inspirations of truth." As we move on with him, our hearts begin to burn within us. The atmosphere becomes Pentecostal. The criticism may be weak, the logic may limp, the interpretation may be forced, and the conclusion lame, here and there, but we feel the heavenly breeze, we see the tongue of flame, we know that, notwithstanding many an instrumental error and imperfection, a man of genius and a man of God is speaking as by inspiration; and oh "that all the Lord's people were also prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them."

And I am tempted to add just here,—oh that in some way there might be brought about a revival of Christian interest in the writings, and especially in the sermons and essays, of Dr. Bushnell. They are unique in literature. They turn upon great subjects; they teem with great thoughts in new, fresh forms; they are everywhere suggestive; they catch the breeze at every tack and turn, and move on with all the steadiness and majesty and buoyancy of a ship at sea; they have utmost felicity of illustration and splendor of diction; they have lost little of their original vitality and vividness; they embody the religious ideas and convictions of a most manful Christian soul; they bear one up and aloft to the high places of thought and feeling and life, where the atmosphere is pure and clear and tonic, and the outlooks are

grand in many directions ; and they seem to me admirably adapted to quicken and freshen the thought, to brace and tone up the religious languor and debility, and to put, if possible, some edge on the dull faith of this present generation of rather faithless Christian people.

Dr. Bushnell was a Providential man. Taking into consideration when he came and what he was and did, he seems to have fulfilled a certain divine appointment. He appeared at a period when the foundations of theological systems were coming under serious suspicion of unsoundness, and the systems themselves under severer suspicion of unsuitableness. One secret of his successful service is lodged in the fact that, while convinced of the necessity of some thorough overhauling of current doctrines, and feeling constrained to undertake that business, he yet held fast by anchorage of experience and conviction to those essential facts and truths in which Christian faith and life have ever had their roots. He fully appreciated the precious treasure in the earthen vessels which seemed to him to have outlasted their usefulness. Unlike many who disbelieve and therefore speak, he spoke because he believed. Indeed, he more than once said that he was striving to revive, in modern and becoming shape, a lost orthodoxy. Amiel says that the great defect of liberal Christianity is its superficial conception of sin. Dr. Bushnell's Christianity had not that defect. Any analysis of Christianity in which sin and salvation from it by divine redemption figure lightly he would have repudiated. Instead of discarding the altar forms and sacrificial symbols of Holy Scripture because of false constructions which had corrupted their meanings, he held to them as divinely prepared and indispensable means of grace, and labored to restore them to their right meanings and uses. He was hospitable to new light, capable of confessing that truth for him had outgrown his previous expositions, and of letting go his own small measures when larger measures were given him. "I have always been trying to mend," he once said. "How can a man ever get rid of his old sins when he cannot let go his little outgrown opinions?" These things I note to indicate how by his positive faith, and real but reasonable and progressive orthodoxy, he was eminently fitted for mediation between old beliefs and some fresh and vital presentation of their essential truths, answerable to experience, consonant with reality, and suitable to life.

Dr. Bushnell had a prophetic sense of things then somewhat remote but swiftly coming on, in the progress of scientific thought and historical criticism, the significance of which his own experiences enabled him to understand. A perusal of the two essays — “Building Eras in Religion” and “The New Education” — will show in what sympathy with all science, in what confidence in real religion, and in what belief of the final issue of their closest grapplings in a reconciliation comparable only “with the reconciliation of the world-schism made by sin itself,” he welcomed their coming conflicts. Men often speak in a large but loose way of strengthening the foundations of religion, making its bulwarks defensible against new enginery of assault, replenishing its armory with more effective weapons, and inspiring its garrison with new confidence in the impregnability of its citadel. All such metaphors suggestive of essential antagonism, to end in the defeat and discomfiture of either science or religion, fail to represent his higher thought and nobler purpose. Dr. Bushnell strove to prepare Christian truth and Christian people to meet and welcome all the most searching investigations which the scientific spirit was sure to make. He created no theological system, founded no school or party, formulated no new dogma of inspiration, miracle, trinity, or atonement, but, as Dr. Bacon well said, “he contributed much to make all the evangelical theology of our English tongue less scholastic, more Scriptural, broader in its views, and more inspiring in its relations to the pulpit and to the Christian life.” But more than all else, he saw through the outward and temporary into the inward and eternal, and reported what he saw with all the enthusiasm of personal experience, with a supreme desire to bring the spirit of Christ to bear upon human life, and with an ardent belief that the Gospel contains just those elements and promises of harmony with God, of brotherly love, and of social justice, which humanity requires for its renovation and perfection. This prophetic insight and utterance constitute the vital, saving, enduring element in all his work. Thus he gave to men not only a broader standing and a surerfootedness in their faith, but a bright vision of its vital truths, and created a new interest and confidence in the Christian religion itself. He put a leaven into Christian thought and life which first created surprising and even alarming fermentations, but which, like that of Jesus’ parable, has worked and still works most wholesomely in the entire mass. Innumerable and

grateful testimonies, public and private, to the services thus rendered have come from all quarters of the English-speaking world.

The stamp of Dr. Bushnell's individuality was on all that he wrote or said. To quote Richard Hooker's sentence: "His being was a kind of law to his working." Both his instrument of thought and his handling of it in the treatment of all subjects were unique. Not only in sermons and treatises, but in the lighter essays, as, for instance, in that exquisite etching, "The Age of Homespun," his characteristic marks are plain. His bell, to use his own words, had a tongue and a voice of its own.

We noted the same thing in his conversation and fragmentary talks, just as there is something in a master's manner of fingering and thumbing and toying with his instrument which indicates what he might do with it. Another characteristic of Dr. Bushnell was his keen sense of humor. There was a rare spice of humor in his composition, that gave zest to his conversation and correspondence and even flavored his serious writing; by no means a preparation of pleasantries by word-play and anecdote sprinkled on the surface for sake of savor, but an aromatic element of his thought. He had also an incisive wit, sometimes caustic as applied to the follies and fallacies of people, but almost never sarcastic, and never cynical as applied to their foibles and infirmities. It would not be difficult to compile a readable volume of his wit and wisdom.

Mr. Froude's description of Cardinal Newman suits Dr. Bushnell so well that I quote it: "An original force of character which refused to be moulded by circumstances and which was to make its own way and become a power in the world; a cleverness of intellectual perception; a disdain of conventionalities; a temper imperious and willful, but always with it a most attractive gentleness, sweetness, and singleness of heart and purpose. His mind was world-wide. He was interested in everything that was going on, in science, politics, and literature. He was careless about his personal prospects. He had no ambition to make a career, or to rise to rank or power. Still less had pleasure any seductions for him. His natural temperament was bright and light. His senses, even the commonest of them, were exceptionally delicate. He could admire enthusiastically any greatness of action or character, however remote the sphere of it from his own."

What this man of such character, genius, and resources might have become or done in the world, what fortune or distinction he

would have achieved as uninspired in his prophetic possibilities, it were idle to conjecture. But Dr. Bushnell exemplified his own doctrine, that "religion is the only sufficient fertilizer of genius." The spirit of Christ passing into him roused all the passion and energy of his moral and intellectual soul. It ennobled his individuality, ruled his imperiousness, stimulated his imagination, enlarged his human interests and sympathies, and guided him into that service in which all his splendid powers found their largest scope and freedom. As President Porter remarked, "Everything that was characteristic of him flourished in the sunshine of his faith." Having what he called a great faith talent, when persuasion and belief had ripened into faith his faith became "a passionate intuition," and airs from heaven were blended with "the breeze of nature stirring in his soul." Out of this inner spiritual life and prophetic consciousness, about which all his manifold gifts assembled themselves for handmaiden co-operation and service, came the quickening forces which he exerted in the world, the pure and noble life, the manifold and wonderful testimony of Jesus, the cheerful expenditure of all his energies for true edification of doctrine, life, and character, on the basis of Jesus Christ, accompanied, as Edward Irving says, "with the scope of eloquence, the creativeness of poetry, the passion of love, the ardors of entreaty, the range of knowledge, the revelation of wisdom, and everything else whereby man standeth aloft at the summit of creation's scale."

It was my inestimable privilege, together with Dr. Burton and Mr. Twichell, to enjoy Dr. Bushnell's intimate acquaintance during the fourteen years previous to his death — years of his illness and infirmity, but not of leisure or rest. Released from pastoral responsibilities, he entered upon "a ministry at large," serving in it by pen and tongue with broken but untiring industry. He preached a great deal, here and there, delivered addresses and orations, wrote and published new sermons and treatises, and labored incessantly and productively just when his frailty "seemed to require perpetual Sabbath." Indeed, he maintained such habits of study and industry, such an interest in human affairs, and such cheerfulness and courage; he so pushed all his vitality to the front and concealed, as much as possible, all signs of feebleness; his mind was so keen and strong and active; there remained to

him so much of the physical pleasure, social enjoyment, intellectual glory and spiritual comfort of life, that we did not fully appreciate his bodily frailty. The following lines from Wordsworth's "Excursion" describe him :

" Plain his garb ;
 Yet he was a man
 Whom no one could have passed without remark ;
 Active and nervous was his gait ; his limbs
 And his whole figure breathed intelligence.
 Time had compressed the freshness of his cheek,
 But had not tamed his eye, that, under brows
 Shaggy and gray, had meanings which it brought
 From years of youth.
 A man of hope and forward-looking mind
 Even to the last.
 And surely never did there live on earth
 A man of kindlier nature."

His inspirations were nowhere more manifest than in the congenial circles of his Christian brethren. Like Victor Hugo's good bishop, "the free wind came with him, and he had the effect upon us of an open door." He sat among us in no conceit or consciousness of pre-eminence. He neither exacted, expected, nor enjoyed demonstrations of deference, and had a frank way of discouraging all such things. Nothing in his carriage, demeanor, or dress denoted superiority, but when he spoke his speech betrayed him. Then, often, the thin wan face became luminous ; the "good, gray head" that all Hartford knew so well wore a coronal glory ; the keen but kindly eyes "seemed (as he once said of his grandmother's eyes) to smite intelligence into people" ; and while the wisdom and the wit and the fresh coinage of language were wonderful, we all most wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth, the tender and mystical strain in which he spake of the things sacredest and dearest to him. Sometimes the topic for discussion seemed so small and scant that we expected to go empty away, when suddenly the five barley loaves and two small fishes were so multiplied, as by the miracle of his speech, that all were fed, and precious fragments remained which, alas ! were not gathered up for preservation, as they should have been. Dr. Bushnell stood in the front rank of those who sought to promote the public good, and in his time was the foremost citizen of Hartford. In grateful recognition of his public

services the city government decreed, while he lay dying, that the beautiful park for which Hartford is indebted to his foresight and perseverance should forever thereafter bear his honored name. I suppose that Dr. Bushnell had faults and imperfections, but I was never impressed by them nor concerned with them. The vividness and absolute frankness of the man made him abrupt at times, and caused that his manner should occasionally misrepresent him to persons imperfectly acquainted with him.

“On him the loyal-hearted hung,
The proud was half disarmed of pride ;
Nor cared the serpent at his side
To flicker with his double tongue.
The stern were mild when he was by,
The flippant put himself to school
And heard him ; and the brazen fool
Was softened, and he knew not why.”

His walk and communion with God were frequently on higher ranges than most of us know, and yet, for the most part, he walked with feet firm-planted on the earth, and, to quote his own words, “was deep enough in religion to be able to live and move naturally in it.” His last earthly state was one of tranquil expectation of going home to be with Christ, “in the conscious, openly revealed friendship of a soul whose affinities are with him,” and “not ashamed to be accepted.” Oh, the dear old doctor !

“How pure at heart and sound in head,
With what divine affections bold !”

We, who were so much with him and greatly revered and loved him, did not, because we could not, take the full measure of his stature and size, and his virtues and values far exceeded our appreciation of them. Fair and bright as he seems to memory looking backward through the mist of years, he seems ever fairer and brighter, greater and worthier, and our reverence and affection for him grow apace, as we know him less and less after the flesh, and more and more after the mind and spirit, and see him “walking in an air of glory.” In what goodly fellowship of the prophets aforetime he walks praiseworthily there, we know not. But, as in recalling him to affectionate remembrance his figure does not shine apart and solitary, but as one of a remarkable group

of eminent fellow laborers in the Congregational ministry of the gospel here, all of whom have gone into the world of light, we cannot and would not think of him as disassociated from them by translation there. As in this lower field of memory, so in the high firmament of our faith, and, we may believe, in the heavens above that firmament, Bushnell and Woolsey and Hawes and Bacon and Porter and Beecher and Burton and Harris and Stowe, not to speak of others less distinguished but not less worthy, move and shine, not separately, but in celestial constellation, and their far light makes, for many of us, the evening sky of life serener and holier.

BUSHNELL AND CHRISTIAN NURTURE

THE DOCTRINE

BY CHARLES E. MCKINLEY

Of all of Dr. Bushnell's writings, those on Christian Nurture were most convincing, and therefore most influential. The series began with an article on "Revivals of Religion", published in 1836. The two discourses on "What Christian Nurture Is" appeared ten years later; but before the book entitled "Christian Nurture" assumed its present form, in 1861, a full quarter of a century had been spent in maturing and elaborating the convictions embodied in it. The book consists of two parts, the first treating of the Doctrine, the second of the Mode, of Christian Nurture. I am to attempt some exposition of Bushnell's Doctrine of Christian Nurture.

The doctrinal problem of the book is the problem of the beginning of the Christian life in the soul; the method is a fresh examination of that beginning from the standpoint of certain vital, human facts; the aim is the removal of the popular presumption that the only proper way to begin the Christian life is by conversion from a life of conscious sin.

To state the doctrinal problem of the book will be to describe a practical situation in the churches, which Dr. Bushnell aimed to modify; for doctrine and practice go more closely together than some would have us think.

The inauguration of the Christian life in the soul is universally regarded as a work of the Holy Spirit. But under what circumstances is this work most likely to be done? What are its requisite antecedents, fitting accompaniments, and proper manifestations?

Prior to the Great Awakening of 1740 there seems to have been a general reliance on the truth as the means by which the Spirit regenerates the soul. To get the truth into the mind was therefore regarded as the best work that could be done to make ready for the beginning of the Christian life. The result was the catechetical system. All emphasis was placed upon knowing and believing the right things; orthodoxy outweighed piety. The

system was a lineal descendant, through Clement of Alexandria with his idea of the true gnosis, and the Schoolmen, from the Socratic doctrine that virtue consists in knowledge. The presumption of the system, though often curiously disguised by theories of sacramental grace, was that to know the Christian ideal is to have it inwrought in one's character; the disciple that is properly instructed, and accepts the faith, will be saved. To be sure, the catechism included a renunciation of the devil and his works, a consecration to Christ and his service; but these were a part of the catechism, to be learned and repeated, not an ideal made winning to the affections and commanding to the will.

In sharp contrast with this is the doctrine of the beginning of the Christian life developed by the New England theologians after the Great Awakening. From Edwards to Park regeneration was regarded as essentially a change in the sentiments or tastes. The younger Edwards defines it as the communication of a new spiritual sense or taste; while the phrase of Professor Park is "a change in the balance of the sensibilities." That a marked change in taste and sentiment accompanies the experience of adult conversion is beyond question; if this change is itself the essential element of regeneration, then appeals to the sentiments, affections or emotions must be more likely to be of use to the Spirit in his efforts to renew a soul than any instruction in the truth. On this doctrinal presumption the methods of the great revival were developed. The psychology of that day made no distinction between the will and the sensibilities, and so the distinctive method of the revival system became an appeal to the will that was essentially emotional in character. And when that distinction grew clear it was still held that it was necessary for the feelings, as Professor James puts it, to "twitch the coat-tails of the will before any action could occur"; and young preachers were insistently instructed to aim to "reach the will through the feelings." It was believed that the beginning of the Christian life in the soul was attended by a great awakening of the feelings, and that regeneration must be manifested in a radical change of inclination or disposition. A conscious experience of this kind became the only acceptable evidence of regeneration; and without regeneration, thus attested, men were not considered fit for membership in the church.

Thus the Christian life was expected to begin, not in the silent use of the truth by the Spirit, but in circumstances that stirred the

religious feelings to their depths with a mighty appeal to hope and fear and aspiration. These circumstances were provided by the revival meeting, which was an institution expressly designed to produce such a disturbance of the customary complacent equilibrium of the soul that the desired change in the balance of the sensibilities might easily come about. The revival methods that began with the Wesleys, Whitefield and Edwards were continued after their death with undiminished popularity. For a full century the churches of New England made revivals their chief dependence for bringing men into the Christian life. The approved way of becoming a Christian was to be converted in a protracted meeting. Attention was fixed upon a certain type of emotional agitation as the proper evidence of the Spirit's working; insistence on the necessity of an experience of this kind made it easy to undervalue early instruction in Christian faith and morals; the older catechetical system died out; the Wesleyan movement in England broke away from the confirmation system of the historic churches; in New England the half-way covenant was abandoned—a very good move itself, but a symptom of a threatening condition; infant baptism was neglected, and the sects that rejected it altogether increased with great rapidity; no place was left for the child in the church of God, because the Christian life was held to begin in emotions that have no place in the soul of a child.

Such was the practical situation in the churches, the outgrowth of current doctrines of the inception of the Christian life, that impelled Bushnell to seek a new doctrine. The evangelical revival had done its work—good work, mostly. It had ended, on this continent, the union of church and state; it had brought every man as an individual into the immediate presence of his personal God and Sovereign, to whom he was accountable for the conduct of his life; it had made the immediate contact of the soul of man with Deity in the Holy Ghost a well-established article of faith; and the one good custom of insisting on individual experience and personal decision in matters of religion was beginning to corrupt the world. The time had come for a decided change of emphasis in religious thought and effort.

The logic of the situation demanded a powerful reassertion of the corporate, organic elements of religious life. The complaint of which the churches were ill was a religious individualism "intense beyond any former example", Dr. Bushnell asserted. "It takes

every man as if he stood alone; presumes that he is unreconciled to God until he has undergone some sudden and explosive experience in adult years. . . . Then, on the other side, or that of the Spirit of God, the very act or *ictus* by which the change is wrought is isolated and individualized, so as to stand in no connection with any other of God's means or causes—an epiphany, in which God leaps from the stars, or some place above, to do a work apart from all system or connection with his other works."

Being a man of vision, Bushnell did not, in his dissatisfaction with current theories of the inception of the Christian life, go back to the errors of a former time. Though in strong reaction against the methods of revivalism, he placed little dependence on instruction as a means of making Christians, and shunned the thought of sacramental grace in baptism as a crude superstition. He sought his doctrine not among the truths or errors of the past, but among the vital facts of human life. He saw that former theories were at variance with those facts. He saw that God does not, as a rule, bring the soul of a child of Christian parents to Himself either by means of the truth taught in the catechism or by a miracle of grace in conversion, but by a vital process in which the moral and religious qualities of that circle in which the child originates are assimilated into his character. Neither the appeal to the intellect, nor the appeal to the affections and the will, fairly meets the conditions of spiritual renewal; the Spirit is life, and moves along those deeper, stronger lines of connection which are not always present to the consciousness through intelligence or feeling, but are always present to the soul as essential and vital.

And so, over against the theory of religion that men are to grow up in evil and be dragged into the church by conquest when they are sufficiently hardened in sin to be converted, Bushnell sets up his doctrine "that the child is to grow up a Christian, and never know himself as being otherwise. Or, in other words, the aim, effort, and expectation should be, not as is commonly assumed, that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age, but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years."

It is hard for some of us to realize that this proposition, now the postulate of all our religious dealing with the young, ever had

to be debated. Nevertheless, it is interesting today to see how Dr. Bushnell marshaled the arguments by which its validity is established.

In the first chapter he argues from the human side: (1) that there is no absurdity in supposing that children are to grow up in Christ; (2) that it is to be expected that Christian education will radically differ from that which is not Christian; (3) that the desire of all Christian parents that their children should grow up in piety argues the possibility of such growth; (4) that, assuming the corruption of human nature, the time to expect a remedy is in the plastic years of infancy and childhood; (5) that children actually do love good and right things because they are good and right, and this is an evidence of the new life in them; (6) that children have been so trained as never to remember the time when they began to be religious; and finally, (7) that there is something like a law of organic connection, as regards character, subsisting between parents and children, and the child for many years after birth is still within the matrix of the parental life, his disposition, will, and character being shaped by theirs.

Following these arguments, he presents another series drawn from the character and revealed will of God: (1) that God desires that children should grow up in piety; (2) that we should expect God to appoint that nurture which will produce holiness, not sin; (3) that God does expressly lay it upon us in the Scriptures to expect that our children will grow up in piety, under the parental nurture; (4) that if the time foretold ever comes, when all shall know Christ from the least to the greatest, children are to grow up in Christ then; if then, why not now? (5) that the Scriptures distinctly recognize the law of organic connection in character between parents and children; and (6) that infant baptism is based upon this connection.

The point in these arguments that especially challenges thought is, of course, the idea of an organic connection in character between parent and child. This is the foundation stone of the doctrine of Christian nurture here set forth. Realizing its importance to his doctrine, Bushnell proceeds, after labeling several faulty methods of dealing with children as "the Ostrich Nurture"—"nature's type of all unmotherhood". to develop his conception of the organic unity of the family. This conception is radically different from anything familiar to the theology of that day. That there is a

moral connection of children with parents, running clear back to the beginning, so that from Adam down all human beings have participated in the common corruption that leads to sin, has been a commonplace of theology, at least ever since Augustine. Bushnell admits the truth in the idea, but holds that it is defective in supposing that the natural taint is transmitted entirely by heredity, ignoring the formative influences of the parental life after the birth of the child. His own position he states in these words: "In maintaining the organic unity of the family, I mean to assert that a power is exercised by parents over children, not only when they teach, encourage, persuade and govern, but without any purposed control whatever. The bond is so intimate that they do it unconsciously and undesignedly—they must do it. Their character, feelings, spirit, and principles must propagate themselves, whether they will or not." In general, he finds the organic unity of the family manifested wherever power is exercised over character without conscious *design* to address the choice on the one side, or a *sense* of responsible choice on the other.

That there is such an intrinsic spiritual unity of the family, which, by processes analogous to those of organic growth, forms the spirit and character of the child for good or bad, he argues from these facts: (1) that the individual is never entirely clear of organic connections; the past of his nation, the past of his family, live in his present; (2) that one generation is the natural offspring of another, and family and racial characteristics, like the miserliness of the Jews, are transmitted for ages; (3) that for a considerable time after birth the child has no capacity of will and choice developed, but is subject to impressions, which become seeds of character in him, "not because his parents will, but under a law of moral infection"; (4) that in all organic bodies, such as states, churches and armies, there is a common spirit by which they are pervaded and distinguished from each other; the same is true of families, and "if some other spirit do not reach the child, the organic spirit of the house will infallibly shape and subordinate his character"; (5) that the workings of family life, after the child begins to develop his voluntary power, impress upon his acts of will the character that distinguishes the morality of the household:— "If the father reads a newspaper on Sunday, the family must help him find it. . . . If the house is a den of disorder and filth, the children must be at home in it."

Were Dr. Bushnell writing at the present time he would have a mass of scientific data, carefully collected and elaborated by skillful investigators, with which to strengthen this argument. In his day a whole range of facts and forces, now being made known through studies in spiritual heredity and the molding influence of environment upon a growing soul, lay almost unobserved; yet he saw quite enough to prove his point. That the bonds of family life are of such a nature as to affect the moral and spiritual qualities of the children as certainly as their stature and features, could hardly be disputed any longer.

Perhaps most of Dr. Bushnell's readers were not disposed to dispute that point, at least when so stated; but it had been totally ignored in the current theories of the beginning of the Christian life. He insists, however, that such a connection, existing necessarily under God's laws of reproduction, ought to be considered in our plans for bringing men to Christ. "It becomes a question of great moment," he says, "whether it is the design of the Christian scheme to take possession of the organic laws of the family and wield them as instruments of a regenerative purpose?" Historic doctrine had recognized the peculiar force with which parental corruption ministers to sin in the child. But "what intelligent person ever supposed that the original constitution, by which one generation derives its existence and receives the bent of its character from another, was designed of God to be the vehicle only of depravity? . . . The only supposition that honors God is that the organic unity of which I speak was ordained originally for the nurture of holy virtue in the beginning of the soul's history, and that Christianity or redemption must of necessity take possession of the abused vehicle and sanctify it for its own merciful uses."

That Christ's redemptive plan has taken possession of this organic connection of the character of the child with that of his parents is Bushnell's doctrine. Regeneration and a Christian character do not follow necessarily from being born to a place in a Christian family; not every child of Christian parents can be certainly made a Christian by nurture. But this is to be the general expectation. The Christian parent may rightly expect to "set forth his child into responsible life as regenerated stock." The presumption is that the Spirit of God will work along these lines of vital connection to reproduce in the children the Christian character of their parents with as much of fidelity and certitude as, by

the same vital connection, their mental and physical characteristics are made to reappear. The line of approach for the Spirit of God to the soul of the child in a Christian home is not, most naturally, through the intellect that is instructed, or the moral habits that are inculcated, or the will that is moved through the feelings, but through those bonds of connection that lie deeper than consciousness and bind life to life in the hidden mystery of being. "Something is wanted," says our author, "that is better than teaching, something that transcends mere effort and will-work, — the loveliness of a good life, the repose of faith, the confidence of righteous expectation, the sacred and cheerful liberty of the Spirit — all glowing about the young soul as a warm and genial nurture, and forming in it, by methods that are silent and imperceptible, a spirit of duty and religious obedience to God."

Bushnell did not get his doctrine from church history, but came to it along a line of original investigation and independent thought. It is therefore all the more convincing to find his conclusions identical with those of Irenæus, the first great defender of the place of the children in the church, whose teaching was that the child born in a Christian family was, from the first dawning of consciousness, to unfold his powers under the imperceptible preventing influences of a sanctifying and ennobling religion; and in such a life the new birth was not to constitute a new crisis, beginning at some definable moment, but was to begin imperceptibly, and so proceed through the whole life.

In the organic unity of the family, thus adopted into the scheme of God's grace for redemptive ends, Bushnell finds rational and satisfactory ground for the practice of infant baptism; here again agreeing with Irenæus, though hardly knowing or caring that he did so. His chapters on infant baptism and the church membership of children, however, are concerned rather with applications of the doctrine of Christian nurture than with its development. But the last chapter in the doctrinal part of his book aims to clinch the argument for Christian nurture by an exhibition of its bearings on the largest task of all, — the Christianization of the world. True to the thesis propounded in one of his earliest writings, that growth, not conquest, is the true method of Christian progress, Bushnell closes his doctrinal presentation of Christian nurture with a chapter on "The Out-Populating Power of the Christian Stock," in which he aims to show that God has ordained a law of popula-

tion in the church as truly as in any earthly kingdom or colony, and by this law of increase Christianity is rolling out and spreading over the world. To be sure, the method of conquest has its rightful place in the conversion of non-Christian peoples; "but," says Dr. Bushnell, "whether the feeble and more abject races are going to be regenerated and raised up is already very much of a question. What if it should be God's purpose to people the world with finer material? Certain it is, whatever expectations we may indulge, that there is a tremendous overbearing surge of power in the Christian nations, which, if the others are not speedily raised to some vastly higher capacity, will inevitably submerge and bury them forever." That might have been written since 1898 instead of previous to 1860. It is surely more conspicuously evident now than it was then; and the serious question which it forces upon the church is the same: What kind of Christianity is this overbearing surge of power in the Christian nations going to give the world?

Bushnell's doctrine of Christian nurture, then, comes to this: the Christian life of the child of Christian parents should not be expected to originate in ideas of truth conveyed to his mind, or in moving appeals addressed to his will, much less in the magic of baptismal regeneration, but rather in the hidden, vital connection of his spirit with the spirit of a household that is leavened by the presence of Christ. Christ, being the spirit and atmosphere of the home, will pass into the soul of the child along those lines of necessary spiritual communication by which all other family traits are imparted. Christian nurture expects much of correct instruction and wise training; but Christian nurture is not instruction or training; it is the impartation and development of life in ways concordant with life's lofty power and fathomless mystery. And the highest life can be thus imparted because the grace of God is pledged to make use of the organic relation of human spirits for the purposes of redemption.

The main objection to this doctrine was that it was "naturalistic" in attitude, and made the Christian life a product of natural forces instead of an operation of divine grace. Now, nothing was more characteristic of Bushnell's mind than his emancipation from the customary opposition between natural and spiritual things. He filled all natural relations and forces with spiritual meanings, and declared, for example, that even physical nurture is divinely appointed to be a means of grace. But the idea that divine grace

should habitually operate through natural processes was a strange thought to that generation. Therefore it was not enough that he should explicitly insist that regeneration, under Christian nurture as truly as in the most stirring revival, must be a work of the Holy Spirit in the soul. His conception of the whole matter was so strange, so foreign to current modes of thought, that a complete new doctrine of the Spirit's methods of activity was necessary. The positions taken in "Christian Nurture" made the work on "Nature and the Supernatural" imperative. Some total reconstruction of the conception of the relation of this human world with its vital forces to the divine world had to be undertaken. Is human nature part of a spiritual province, the scene of the Spirit's constant activities, or is it alien territory, to be invaded now and then for purposes of grace from some celestial stronghold? That God does operate upon the human world from without, Bushnell holds with a faith as sturdy as any; but he believes in a fixed relation between the immediate operations of the Spirit and those which are mediated through institutions rooted in our humanity. And "if there is a fixed relation between God's mediate and immediate agency in souls, how great is the mistake when we virtually assume, in our efforts and expectations, that He will come upon souls only as the lightning is bolted from out of the sky"!

To have enunciated the doctrine that we have been considering fifty years ago, was an achievement that proved its author both a seer and a thinker. Only the prophetic vision could then have seen, in the deep, common facts of life, the impressive spiritual truth that Bushnell saw. Only patient, penetrative thinking could have developed its rational meaning on such broad and conclusive lines. "No book of New England origin," said Dr. Munger in this place a few weeks ago, "save only Edwards on the 'Will' ever exerted so wide and powerful an influence." A revolution has taken place in the popular idea of how the Christian life should be expected to begin. Bushnell has compelled us, in theory at least — and theory and practice are not always contrary — to make for the Holy Spirit a dwelling place in the homes of men, where he may come, not now and then as a heavenly stranger, to work a miracle of grace, but as a familiar Presence to abide, working daily in us and ours that which is well-pleasing unto God. In our New England firmament the author of this doctrine of Christian nurture was the morning star of that glad new day when joyous

faith should realize once more that God is in His world; that heavenly grace comes into human lives on the common ray of daily sunshine as well as on the lightning's blinding flash, while the very atmosphere about us is charged with holy energies, because — "Now are we the children of God."

BUSHNELL AND CHRISTIAN NURTURE

THE MODE

BY WILLIAM J. MUTCH

The practical difficulty in accomplishing a genuine Christian nurture lies in the mode. Yet in the discussion of it in Bushnell's day, as well as in ours, it was needful to feel under foot a firm basis of true doctrine. He therefore laid down the two fundamental theses of Congenital Christianity, and the Organic Unity of the Family. He defended them successfully, and as theoretical propositions they stand today unchallenged.

But the Christian world is about as far now as it was then from being ready to carry out with hearty zeal the methods of treatment called for by these doctrines. The doctrines have either failed to reach the people, or they have not awakened the enthusiasm which they so well deserve.

In these days it is not enough that a doctrine shall go unchallenged; it must be both preached and practiced with untiring zeal, or it might as well remain locked in the unknown. It can come to its own only by an industrious propaganda in which actual results and ample fruits are in evidence to vindicate the precept.

No one cares very much now whether the Christian life begins within the horizon of the child's memory or not, as a matter of doctrine. But if we can see that the one view is actually issuing in strong character, while the other is not, then we have the best of reasons for positive action. Moreover, the world will await action until it sees that reason, and even longer.

Bushnell did not fail to see how defective was the doctrinal conception of the Christian life commonly held, and it was at that point that he had his great contest with the men of his time. But he also saw that the most pressing need was for a right mode of Christian nurture. And he addressed himself boldly to the task

of prescribing a right mode, while as yet few people assented to the doctrines on which he based the mode. That is the reason why this strikingly modern book has never produced the results in practical life to which it seems entitled. It has taken fifty years for it to win its doctrinal position ; and it is just now coming in for a new lease of power as a practical handbook of method. May the latter be its greater glory.

If, by instinct or inspiration, Horace Bushnell was enabled to take positions in theology which now seem to us to have been prophetic, he did the same in psychology to a degree even more surprising. Our laboratory pioneers in the psychology of religion have scarcely done more than to corroborate with statistics and curves the old propositions which Bushnell laid down two generations ago in *Christian Nurture*.

Perhaps it should be said once more, that it is not the men who plead for a true psychology and a true pedagogy in Christian nurture, who advocate the restoration of the medieval catechism. Its stiff theological dogma, its technical vocabulary, and its memoriter method preclude it from ever finding a place in modern life. And so it is that Bushnell strikes a true note when he rules out the catechism from his mode of Christian nurture in these words :*

“ I do not undertake to say that nothing shall be taught which is not in the words of Scripture. But it must be obvious that very small children are more likely to be worried and drummed into apathy by dogmatic catechisms, than to get any profit from them. If exercised in them at all, it should be at a later period, when their intelligence is considerably advanced ; that they may at least get some shadow of meaning in them to repay the labor of committing them to memory. It is generally supposed, in the arguments urged for a training in the catechism, that the real advantage to be gained is the fastening or anchoring of the child in some fixed faith. But the deplorable fact is, that what is called a fastening is really a shutting in, or encasing of the soul, in that particular shell of opinion — the training of the child to be a sectarian *before* he is a Christian.”

The catechumenate of the early church was, at least in its idea, natural and true to religion and life, and it bore fruit accordingly. But when the method became mechanical and formal, and when the catechism itself became theological and apologetic, as contrasted with the matter and form of the gospels, it ceased to breathe and

had to die. No wonder that the bare gospel was taken up in preference to it.

The formal catechism must always be open to the same defects in use. It can never become the chief agency in Christian nurture. It may be, as it is now in some branches of the church, an instrument of ecclesiastical discipline for the final initiation into the rites of the cult, by which the candidates become proficient in the work of the order. But all that comes at a period after the real work of Christian nurture is past, or at least, after the natural time for it is past. We must, of course, distinguish between a catechism and a text-book. Text-books and instruction there must always be, but the typical and traditional catechism cannot much longer continue in the face of modern text-books and improved methods of instruction. Christian nurture is not by any means confined to teaching, but there is an important part of it which is teaching pure and simple, and that teaching must be done according to the principles which govern all teaching, or it will surely fail.

That mode of Christian nurture which finds its only opportunity a few weeks before the young people are to unite with the church, and its only instrument a catechism to be memorized, is no nurture at all. It is no better than a horticulture which does nothing until autumn, and then goes into the woods and picks such grapes and berries and apples as it can find. The young person about to come into full connection with the church, and to take a position in adult society, is to be regarded as in a sense the product of nurture, and not as the raw material for it. After ingatherings of young people, it has of late been customary in the effervescence of pious resolution to say that now they must not be neglected, but must be kept at work and so trained into active church members. It would be more to the point if this were thought of when they are born into the world, rather than when they are sent forth as full-fledged products of our method.

Another important negative point in the mode of Christian nurture is stated by Bushnell in these words : *

“ Parents, therefore, in the religious teaching of their children, are not to have it as a point of fidelity to press them into some crisis of high experience, called conversion. Their teaching is to be that which feeds a

* Page 381.

growth, not that which stirs a revolution. It is to be nurture, presuming on a grace already and always given, and for just that reason, jealously careful to raise no thought of some high climax to be passed. For precisely here is the special advantage of a true sacramental nurture in the promise, that it does not put the child on passing a crisis, where he is thrown out of balance not unlikely, and becomes artificially conscious of himself, but it leaves him to be always increasing his faith, and reaching forward, in the simplest and most dutiful manner, to become what God is helping him to be."

The generation now past has proven the correctness of Bushnell's position on the evangelistic revival as a means of promoting the life of the church, and the specially bad effects of this system upon children. The position is to this day not a welcome one in the eyes of many of our most earnest Christian people. But its truth is being forced upon the most reluctant minds by the complete failure of these revival efforts in recent years. The failure is not in getting the children to sign cards, or to rise for prayers, or to unite with the church. Any irresponsible person with a few stories and some skill in psychic suggestion can easily induce children in any numbers to do whatever he asks them. But the impression thereby produced on the children does not prove to be decisive for good in more than a very small proportion of cases, while it does in many cases produce an after revulsion of feeling which is fatal to religious life.

But these are the least serious counts against the revival system of Christian nurture. Far more deplorable is the false and deadly conception of religious experience which it creates. Children are taught to look for impossible things, and in so doing they ignore the real elements of Christian life and character. They look for a spiritual convulsion that never comes, and forget the weightier matters of law, justice, mercy, and faith, like people looking for the end of the world and forgetting to cultivate their fields and pay their debts. In straining after the repentance of the Latin theology, they miss the changed mind or new heart of the Greek New Testament. A lifelong attention to the cultivation of the spiritual nature cannot be thought of when one is looking for a mythical cataclysm in which the whole result is expected to be accomplished at a single stroke.

The catechism and the revival are the two antidotes which the delinquent Christian community has employed to neutralize the

bad effects of what Bushnell called "Ostrich Nurture." Both these agencies might have their value when preceded by a genuine Christian nurture, and when adapted to a true conception of the Christian life. But until both these things have been done it is worse than vain to trifle with either agency, for they are both delusions standing in the way of real nurture.

But now for the true and only mode of Christian nurture. The two principles of congenital Christianity and the organic unity of the family point with the certainty of a surveyor's triangle to the true and inevitable mode. Its great stronghold must be in the family, its progress must be in equal step with physical growth and the development of the senses, and in harmony with the God-given nature of the child, not in antagonism with the nature at every possible point, on the supposition that that nature is of the devil.

"The very common impression is that nothing is to be done for the religious character of children, till they are old enough to form religious judgments, put forth religious choices, take the meaning of the Christian truths, and perceive what is in them as related to the wants of sin consciously felt and reflected on. There could not be a more sad or, in fact, more desolating mistake, in any matter, either of duty or of privilege. . . . All the tenderest pressures of affection might be expected to force it aside, and clear the field of its really cruel usurpations." *

Hereditary factors greatly complicate the problem, although they are a narrowing and branching stream as we trace them back from birth.

"In our birth, we not only begin to breathe and circulate blood, but it is a question hugely significant whose the blood may be. For in this we have whole rivers of predispositions, good or bad, set running in us — as much more powerful to shape our future than all tuitional and regulative influences that come after, as they are earlier in their beginnings, deeper in their insertion, and more constant in their operation. It is a great mistake to suppose that men and women, such as are to be fathers and mothers, are affected only in their souls by religious experience, and not in their bodies." †

The first cry of the infant is an appeal for moral and spiritual nurture quite as much as for physical nurture. It is alike unconscious of them all. Food and warmth and personal attention

* Page 228.

† Page 229.

please him before he is aware that these are what make him comfortable. The privation of some of these things until the proper interval for the sake of health and good habits is the first occasion of discomfort, though he does not know it. He is only conscious of discomfort, and not of the cause of it. Comforts and discomforts are soon taken as a matter of course by him, providing they are not connected with voluntary actions of his own, such as crying. If crying brings comfort he has discovered his first lesson in cause and effect, and he works it just as industriously as if his discovery were a truth and not the pernicious error that it is ; for crying is no proper or true producing cause of comfort.

If comforts come just the same whether he cries or not, he will never cry voluntarily. And voluntary crying or fretting is the most pernicious practice of infancy, because by it the first footpath of conduct and character is struck out in moral perversity and crookedness ; and there is actually produced in the rapidly growing cells of the brain a physical basis for original sin. If discomfort follows either naturally or artificially from certain conduct and is relieved by reverse conduct, the result needs only to be repeated two or three times until he notices the connection, in order to regulate his conduct and to teach him to know and respect a natural or moral law. It is observation and not talk that counts with him. What he needs most and is least likely to find is a moral and personal environment that is just as calmly uniform in its laws and reactions as his physical environment. But if his observations upon his moral and personal environment are confused by irregularity of results, he loses his reckonings. His conduct becomes irregular and impulsive. His school of experience has been spoiled for him, because his moral environment has been demoralized. He does not see the solemn, steady, and invincible march of moral order and result. He sees rather a weak and vacillating parody full of petulant scolding and nerveless yielding, with occasional flashes of violent passion. He cannot learn to respect moral law under these conditions ; and it is not strange that he becomes skeptical of the very existence of such a law.

Just here is the crucial point of Christian nurture. It begins to be decisive of character not at the period of adolescence, not at the point when reason begins to act in logical abstractions, not at

the age for school or kindergarten, not when he begins to talk, but direct Christian nurture begins to determine the foundations of character when the child draws his first breath.

Bushnell lays the greatest of emphasis upon a distinction obscure in time, but none the less real in mental analysis.

“It is the distinction between the age of impressions and the age of tuitional influences; or between the age of existence in the will of the parent and the age of will and personal choice in the child. . . . Now the very common assumption is that, in what we have called the age of impressions, there is really nothing done, or to be done, for the religious character. . . . The child, in other words, is to come into intelligence through perfect unintelligence; to get the power of words out of the words themselves, and without any experience whereby their meaning is developed; to be taught responsibility under moral and religious ideas, when the experience has unfolded no such ideas. . . . Just contrary to this, I suspect, and I think it can be shown by sufficient evidence, that more is done to affect, or fix, the moral and religious character of children, before the age of language than after; that the age of impressions, when parents are commonly waiting in idle security, or trifling away their time in mischievous indiscretions, or giving up their children to the chance of such keeping as nurses and attendants may exercise, is, in fact, the golden opportunity; when more is likely to be done for their advantage or damage, than in all the instruction and discipline of their minority afterward.”*

We are to this day neglecting the vastly important doctrine of language which Bushnell laid at the foundation of all Christian nurture.

“Language itself has no meaning till rudimental impressions are first begotten in the life of experience, to give it meaning. Words are useful to propagate meanings, or to further develop and combine meanings, but a child would never know the meaning of any word in a language just by hearing the sound of it in his ears. He must learn to put the meaning into it, by having found that meaning in his impressions, and then the word becomes significant. And it requires a certain wakefulness and capacity of intelligent apprehension, to receive and take up such impressions. Thus a dog would never get hold of any religious impressions at the family prayers, all his lifetime; but a child will be fast gathering up, out of his little life and experience, impressional states and associations that give meanings to the words of prayer, as they in turn give meanings to the facts of his experience.”†

* Pages 233 ff.

† Page 239.

Bushnell marked out in advance an important position for the modern masters of child study, like that taken by Perez in his book entitled "The First Three Years of Childhood." He said :

"I have no scales to measure quantities of effects in this matter of early training, but I may be allowed to express my solemn conviction that more, as a general fact, is done, or lost by neglect of doing, on a child's immortality, in the first three years of his life, than in all his years of discipline afterwards. . . . Let every Christian father and mother understand, when their child is three years old, that they have done more than half of all they will ever do for his character." *

The importance of this position may not be apparent at first sight, but it must become so as soon as we seriously grapple with the problem of providing a real nurture, and look for the most favorable time to apply it.

Nothing could be more conclusive or more important than Bushnell's discussion of the training of the responsible will in the infant during the age of impressions. His will is not responsible, because not acquainted with those laws and conditions of choice which make it responsible. The will power of the soul has to be tamed and trained into obedience to the wise direction of others before it can be expected to respond truly to his own wisdom yet to come. His willful self-assertion may go on until he becomes a demon let loose in God's eternity, or, by learning obedience and duty to God, he may become a free prince of the realm. Let there be no fight begun, no breaking of the will. This willfulness, or obstinacy, is not so purely bad or evil as it seems. He is beginning to feel himself and you ; he is getting hold of the conditions of authority, and feeling out his limitations. It is no kindness to remove those limitations now, and afterward to surprise and confuse him by replacing them. Gently but firmly draw the will down from self-assertion to self-devotion. Carry him, stand him on his feet, set him here or there, do just that in him which he refuses to do in himself — all this gently and kindly as if he were capable of maintaining no issue at all. Do it again and again as often as may be necessary. By-and-by he will begin to perceive that his obstinacy is but the fussing of his weakness ; till finally, as the sense of limitation comes up into a sense of law and

duty, he will be found to have learned, even beforehand, the folly of self-assertion.*

“It is the even handling of repose and gentle affection which lays a child down to its sleep so firmly that it goes to sleep as in duty bound ; which refuses to wear out the night in laborious caresses and coaxings that only reward the cries they endeavor to compose, which places the child so firmly, makes so little of the protests of caprice in it, wears a look so gentle and loving, and goes on with such evenness of system, that the child feels itself to be, all the while, in another will, and that a good will ; consenting thus by habit and quietly to be lapped in authority, just as it consents to breathe in the lap of nature and her atmospheric laws. . . . When the time of words arrives, the child is already under government, and the question of obedience and order is already half settled.” †

He may not be morally responsible, but in most cases the seed has been planted, in this period, of what he is to be. A right discipline has already produced the roots of a regenerate life. Mismanagement and neglect, on the other hand, plants the seeds of vice and misery that grow afterward into a character in its own kind. Training for parentage seems to be the most pressing need of Christian nurture.

At no point does Bushnell reveal the modernness of his spirit more strikingly than in the prominence which he gives to the physical basis of character. The title and text of the third chapter tell the whole story. “Physical Nurture, to be a Means of Grace.” “Feed me with food convenient for me, lest I be full and deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord ?” Proverbs 30 : 8, 9.

He laid down clearly and made available for our use both sides of the psycho-physical inter-relation, although scientific men are still struggling with its demonstration. In speaking of the parental and prenatal part of nurture, he says that, “The subjects of grace are penetrated bodily all through by the work of the Spirit in their life.” ‡ And in another connection he shows “That the treatment and fare of the body has much to do with the quality of the soul, or mind — its affinities, passions, aspirations, tempers ; its powers of thought and sentiments, its imaginations, its moral and religious development.” §

The study of the brain since Bushnell’s day has revealed the fact, or at least established as a fact what was before a mere guess,

* Pages 243 ff.

† Pages 323 f.

‡ Page 229.

§ Page 271.

that a right discipline in the first years produces in the brain cells a basis for corresponding thought and action in after life. If neglect and mismanagement takes the place of true discipline, then a brain mechanism is produced which is entirely unfavorable to right thought, emotion, and volition. So there is a plain physical necessity to furnish a correct discipline for infancy before we can be at all certain of producing true adult character. And it is just that certainty of result which the Christian enterprise and moral earnestness of the coming day must provide for.

Bushnell did not treat of the church school, because in his day it was not much of a factor in Christian nurture, and because, like the catechism and the revival, it did not touch the child until after the real period of his nurture was past. He criticised even then that tendency which has now become chronic for the family to abdicate its function and privilege in favor of the church and the school. By assuming to provide a nurture, and allowing the people to suppose that they can and do furnish it, those institutions are in reality defeating the very end for which they are established. They actually encourage that caricature of parental fidelity which he well named "Ostrich Nurture."

But when the church and the school have laid back on the family what belongs there, and have seriously undertaken their own secondary task, there is every reason for believing that Christian nurture will succeed, and that Christianity will come into possession of its own.

Those who have been more recently interested in Christian nurture have been concerned with half-grown children; and so in reading Bushnell's book they have been disappointed, not finding the immediate help which they were looking for. They have desired instructions for gathering fine fruit out of the wilderness. There have been many who have professed to give such instructions, but neither Horace Bushnell nor any one else can give true instructions in this impossible art, and Bushnell was too wise to try it. In this book he is rather telling us how we may prepare the garden and the vineyard in such a way that after some years of industrious cultivation we may hope to grow fine fruit.

He is not saying much about how to pick and preserve the fruit. That was not then nor is it now a pressing consideration. It is like some of the theological problems which he left untouched at the risk of incompleteness because others were more pressing.

You may harry the forest with rakes and patent fruit-pickers, and you may come back crestfallen with a few sour grapes and bitter crab apples in your basket. You may harry the community with revivals and catechisms and return with equally disappointing results. Even the Sunday-school, that paragon of social mechanism, can only do its own work, and not the greater work of the family also. The church will have to continue in an up-hill struggle, until a just reckoning has been had with the principles and methods set forth in Bushnell's "Christian Nurture."

Date Due

APR 19 1951

090

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

9.3.77

Bushnell Centenary

DATE

ISSUED BY

Man. 26^{1.57} P. 8^{Rev.}

JUL 21

